THE RELATIONSHIP OF CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY LEADERS TO TYPOLOGY OF POWER STRUCTURE AND LEVEL OF FINANCIAL EFFORT FOR EDUCATION IN TWENTY-FOUR SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN FOUR STATES

By
WILLIAM HOWARD BASHAW

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the many persons who took an active interest in the preparation of this dissertation.

The assistance of the chairman of the writer's supervisory committee, Dr. R. L. Johns, is gratefully acknowledged. His wise counsel and interest throughout has been invaluable to the writer, for which he will always be deeply indebted. Sincere thanks is also given for the time and assistance provided by the members of the committee, Dr. R. B. Kimbrough, Dr. C. M. Bridges, and Mr. Charles Robbins.

The writer is also grateful to his employer, Mr. J. Hartley Blackburn, for his interest and encouragement and the provision of leave time necessary for the completion of this study.

Finally, a special thanks is extended to the writer's wife, Myrtle, and children, Jeaneen and Chad, for their patience and understanding during the necessary time taken away from family pursuits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		v
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	2
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Need for the Study	3
	Delimitations	4
	Definition of Terms	4
	Review of Related Research	5
	Hypotheses	8
	Procedures	9
	Organization of the Study by Chapters	12
II.	THE STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL PATTERNS OF LEADERS	13
	Summary of Occupational Patterns for All Districts	17
	The Relationship of Occupational Patterns of Leaders to Level of Local Financial Effort for Education	17
	The Relationship of Occupational Patterns of Leaders to Typology of Power Structure	27
	Summary	45
III.	THE STUDY OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERS	50
	The Relationship of Personal Characteristics to Level of Local Financial Effort for Education	51
	The Relationship of Personal Characteristics to Typology of Power Structure	87
	Summary	119
IV.	SUMMARY	128
	Results	128
	Conclusions and Implications	137

Page

APPENDIX A 143

APPENDIX B 144

APPENDIX C 147

APPENDIX D 153

APPENDIX E 154

APPENDIX F 155

APPENDIX G 156

APPENDIX H 158

APPENDIX I 159

APPENDIX J 160

APPENDIX K 161

BIBLIOGRAPHY 162

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Districts, by States, Showing Level of Fiscal Effort and Type of Power Structure	15
2.	Distribution of Leaders Both Within and Between Occupational Categories, Showing Number and Per Cent by Districts and by States	16
3.	Summary of Distribution of Occupations for all Districts by Number and Per Cent	18
4.	Contingency Table of Number of Leaders in Each Occupational Category by High and Low Effort	19
5.	The Difference of Proportions of Each Occupational Category in High and Low Level Districts	21
6.	Average Rank of Leaders by Occupation in High and Low Effort Districts	22
7A.	Contingency Table of Distribution of Occupations of Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders in Each District by High and Low Effort	23
7B.	Contingency Table of Distribution of Occupations of Six Highest Ranked Leaders in Each District by High and Low Effort	23
8.	Analysis of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each District, by High and Low Effort Districts	24
9.	Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Categories to Level of Financial Effort for Education, by States	26
10A.	Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Florida District, to High and Low Effort Districts	28

Table

Page

10B. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Georgia District, to High and Low Effort Districts. . 29

10C. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Kentucky District, to High and Low Effort Districts . 30

10D. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Illinois District, to High and Low Effort Districts . 31

11. Contingency Table of Number of Leaders in Each Occupational Category in All Districts, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Power Structures. 32

12. The Difference of Proportions of Each Occupational Category in All Districts, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Power Structures. 34

13. Average Rank of Leaders by Occupation in Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 35

14A. Contingency Table of Distribution of Occupations of Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders in Each District by Non-Competitive and Competitive Power Structures . 37

14B. Contingency Table of Distribution of Occupations of Six Highest Ranked Leaders in Each District by Non-Competitive and Competitive Districts 37

15. Analysis of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each District, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 38

16A. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Florida District to Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 40

16B. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Georgia District to Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 41

Table | Page

16C. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Kentucky District to Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts. 42

16D. Analysis of the Relationship of Occupational Distribution of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each Illinois District to Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts. 43

17. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders by High and Low Financial Effort. 52

18. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders by High and Low Effort Districts and Occupational Categories 53

19. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. . . . 55

20. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Financial Effort Districts. 56

21. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 59

22. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by Occupational Categories. 59

23. Years of Formal Education Among the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts 61

24. Years of Formal Education of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each District by High and Low Effort and Occupational Categories 62

Table

Page

25. Years of Formal Education of All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 63

26. Average Number of Children of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts . . 65

27. Average Number of Children of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders in Each District, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 66

28. Average Number of Children in School of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts. 67

29. Average Number of Children in School of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 68

30. Per Cent of Children in Private Schools of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts. 69

31. Per Cent of Children in Private Schools of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 71

32. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts. 72

33. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts Among the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 73

34. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts Among the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort and Occupational Categories. 75

35. Membership of More Than 50 Per Cent of the Leaders in Organizations, by High and Low Effort Districts. . 76

Table

Page

36. Rankings by Per Cent of Influential Organizations by Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts. 78

37. Church Membership of Leaders by High and Low Effort Districts. 79

38. Church Membership of Leaders by High and Low Effort Districts and States 81

39. Average Number of Relatives Per Leader Who Resided in the District, Excluding Leader's Own Household, by High and Low Effort Districts. 82

40. Average Number of Relatives Per Leader Who Resided in the District, Excluding Leader's Own Household, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States. 83

41. Per Cent of Participation in Community Issues by the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts 85

42. Per Cent of Participation in Community Issues by the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by High and Low Effort Districts and by States 86

43. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 88

44. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and Occupational Categories 89

45. Average Ages of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States. 91

46. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 92

47. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and Occupational Categories . . 93

Table

Page

48. Average Number of Years' Residence in District of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 95

49. Years of Formal Education Among the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts. 96

50. Years of Formal Education of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and Occupational Categories. 97

51. Years of Formal Education of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States. 98

52. Average Number of Children of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts. 100

53. Average Number of Children of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States. 101

54. Average Number of Children in School of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 102

55. Average Number of Children in School of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 103

56. Per Cent of Children in Private Schools of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 105

57. Per Cent of Children in Private Schools of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 106

Table

Page

58. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 107

59. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 108

60. Per Cent Who Were Native Residents of Their Districts of the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and Occupational Categories. 109

61. Membership of More Than 50 Per Cent of the Leaders in Organizations, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts. 111

62. Rankings by Per Cent of Influential Organizations by Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 112

63. Church Membership of Leaders by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 114

64. Church Membership of Leaders by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 115

65. Average Number of Relatives Per Leader Who Resided in the District, Excluding Leader's Own Household, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 117

66. Average Number of Relatives Per Leader Who Resided in the District, Excluding Leader's Own Household, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and States. 118

67. Per Cent of Participation in Community Issues by the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts 120

68. Per Cent of Participation in Community Issues by the Six Highest Ranked Leaders, Fifteen Highest Ranked Leaders, and All Leaders, by Competitive and Non-Competitive Districts and by States 121

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between the level of financial support for education and the quality of the school program has been investigated by a number of writers. Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1967), while pointing out that the relationship may be complicated by specific factors, maintained that, in general, increased expenditures within reasonable limits seemed to result in a better program of education. Norton (1966) reported on a compilation of studies which supported overwhelmingly the conclusion that a higher quality education was generally provided in school systems spending larger amounts per pupil.

The economic value of increased expenditures for education has been investigated by a number of writers, including Schultz (1961) and Fabricant (1959), who found a positive relationship between increased educational expenditures and the national economy. Groves (1966) maintained that there was strong support for the view that society and government could do much to foster economic growth, especially by generous outlays for research and education.

Since financial support of schools is generally accepted by educators as one measure of quality, the variables affecting this measure should become matters of interest and concern. In recent years this problem of financial support for education has been investigated through the study of community power systems.

The fact that public education is in many ways a political enterprise is no longer a serious argument. Bailey (1962) pointed out that the discussion centers around the nature of this relationship and the associated dynamics of public decision-making. Studies by Hunter (1953), Dahl (1961), Kimbrough (1964), Presthus (1964), and others emphasized the need to identify the power structure of influentials in a community, since it was largely within this framework that public decisions were made.

Studies by Marsh (1965), Easley (1966), Marlantes (1966), Shaffer (1966), Owens (1966), Palmer (1966), and Johns (1967) identified the characteristics of the power structures in twenty-four school districts. Other studies by Hopper (1965), Adams (1965), King (1965), and Quick (1965) determined the level of financial support for education in these same districts. Further examination of certain characteristics of the leaders in these districts to determine their relationship to typology of power structure and to local financial effort for education should be of great interest.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected characteristics of community leaders which might affect the patterns of decision-making and have an ultimate affect on the level of financial support for education in the community.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between selected characteristics of the influential leaders in twenty-four school districts and the typology of power structure and also the level of financial effort for education.

Specifically, the following subdivisions or areas were investigated, as they related to typology of power structure and local financial effort for education:

1. Occupational patterns of the leaders
2. The following personal characteristics of the leaders:
    a. Ages of leaders
    b. Years' residence in district
    c. Years of formal education
    d. Number of children
    e. School status of children
    f. Original residence
    g. Membership in organizations
    h. Church membership
    i. Adult relatives in district
    j. Leader participation in issues

Need for the Study

In order to gain further insights into the financial support of education, it was deemed desirable to investigate the characteristics of the community leaders in the twenty-four districts included in this

study to determine the relationship of those characteristics to the structure of power and to the support of education in the community. A better understanding of these elements of community power structure should enable educators to plan better strategies for educational improvement.

Delimitations

This study was limited to twenty-four selected school districts in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, and Illinois. These districts were identified as those making the highest financial effort in relation to ability and those making the lowest effort among all districts of 20,000 or more population in these states.

Definition of Terms

Elitism: A pattern of decision-making characterized by limited mass participation in community issues, and their domination by a small number of leaders.

Pluralism: A political system in which the power of government is broadly shared with a plethora of private groups or individuals.

Effort: The relationship between district revenue receipts from taxes and tax redemptions, and the net effective buying income. Effort is the ratio of revenue receipts to net effective buying income.

Political leader: One in public office, or who has been in recent years, and whose major basis of power is political.

Economic leader: One whose power is derived from an economic base such as commerce, industry, or finance.

Specialist leaders: The residual group whose special competence and interest allow its members access to influence; usually this group would be most interested in education, health, or welfare.

Community leader: A person in the community who is attributed a high degree of influence.

Formal organizations: Those community groups, both governmental and non-governmental, which are characterized by a formal name, elected officers, by-laws, official meeting dates, or other evidences of formal structure.

Typology of power structure: The model used to identify the types of power structures. In this study the typology consists of two types: competitive and non-competitive.

Review of Related Research

The study of community power structure has usually centered around two primary approaches: the "reputational" and the "decision analysis" techniques. Hunter (1953), Thometz (1963) and others utilized the reputational approach and concluded that power was centered in an economic elite. Dahl (1961), Banfield and Wilson (1963), Greer (1962), and others using the decision analysis technique rejected the monopolistic findings in favor of a pluralistic power structure with economic dominants as only one of several kinds of influence in a community.

The major questions raised by those studies were whether the reputational technique would always uncover a monolithic structure and the decision analysis technique a pluralism, and which approach was correct.

Kimbrough (1964), Kimbrough and Johns (1966), Agger, Goldrich, and Swanson (1964), Presthus (1964) and others concluded that several types of power structure existed and that the findings of both approaches had validity. That is, feeling both approaches compatible, they have combined them.

Within different power systems are the individuals who exercise control over the decision-making process and as such determine the type of power structure to be found in the community. These leaders are engaged in a variety of occupations, each possessing his own set of personal characteristics. The distribution of occupations and the other personal characteristics of leaders are both of interest to the student of community power structure.

In assessing the distribution of occupations, it is clear that the role of the specialist is not a major one. Gregg (1965) pointed out that the specialists were almost never ascribed a high level reputation for influencing any type of critical community decision. Kimbrough and Johns (1966) found little evidence of significant participation of the specialist in the decision-making process. Hunter (1953) found almost no influence by the specialist. Dahl (1961), Kammerer (1962), Presthus (1964) and others found that influence, when exerted, has generally been through the public body governing their particular specialization. Thometz (1963), however, indicated that most city councilmen and school board members in Dallas were, in effect, selected by the business dominated power group. Similarly, Hunter (1953) implied that most city officials held office at the pleasure of the informal power structure.

The relative importance of the economic and political spheres is not as clear. While Hunter (1953) and Thometz (1963) supported rather unequivocally the position that the economic influentials dominated the decision-making process, Form and D'Antonio (1959), Miller (1958) and others modified their basic agreement with the caution that political action counter to the dominant business interest was possible. Dahl (1961), Sayre and Kaufman (1960), Polsby (1959) and others supporting the decision analysis technique believed that the economic sphere was just one determinant, with the political sphere given the greater place of importance. It is also interesting to note that they considered the pluralistic structure more permeable by the specialist. Presthus (1964), in his study using the combination approach to analysis of power, was unable to conclude that either element of the community dominated, as he found a difference in the two communities of his study. The question appears to be still unanswered.

The need to study the personal characteristics of the leaders has been pointed out by many writers. Minar (1964) emphasized the need to further analyze community power structure by studying the characteristics of the community and its inhabitants. Mills (1956) pointed out that the changing face of the local community has dramatized the changes in the characteristics of those who affect the balance of power. One example is the in-migration of industry and its leadership, which has resulted in cleavages between "old guard" inhabitants and the "new men."

The part played by organized interest groups and organizations was considered to be of increasing importance by Stanley (1953).

Although Dahl (1961), Hyman and Wright (1958) and others indicated that participation by citizens in voluntary associations was quite low, the possibility existed that this was not true of the leaders in a community, a possibility investigated in the present study.

Hypotheses

1. There are more political leaders in high effort districts than in low effort districts and also more political leaders in competitive districts.

2. Specialists, although less numerous in all types of districts than other types of leaders, are comparatively more numerous in high effort districts and in competitive districts.

3. The economic leaders are more numerous than other leaders in all types of districts, but they appear less often in high effort districts than in low effort districts, and less often in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts.

4. When higher ranked leaders only are compared, the number of political leaders is proportionately greater in all types of districts, while the proportionate number of specialist leaders is less.

5. Leaders are younger, have lived in their districts a shorter period of time, and represent a smaller proportion of original residents in high effort districts than in low effort distrcts, and in competitive districts as compared to non-competitive districts.

6. There is little difference among leaders in all types of districts in the number of children and school status of children of leaders.

7. There is little difference in the formal education of leaders in the different types of districts.

8. There is little difference in the church membership patterns of leaders in the different types of districts.

9. Leaders have more organizational memberships and participate in community issues more in high effort districts than in low effort districts, and also in competitive districts as compared to non-competitive districts.

Procedures

Twenty-four districts which were previously identified by level of fiscal effort and by typology of power structure were utilized in this study. The method used in earlier studies for determining fiscal effort is summarized in Appendix A. The method used for determining typology of power structure is summarized in Appendix B.

Summary of Data

Data collected on Interview Guide B (Appendix C) were summarized to show:

A. The distribution of leadership in the three occupational categories of economic, political and specialist.

B. The type of power structure and level of fiscal effort for each district.

C. The following personal characteristics of leaders in each district:

1. Ages of leaders
2. Years' residence in district
3. Years of formal education
4. Number of children
5. School status of children
6. Original residence
7. Membership in organizations
8. Church membership
9. Adult relatives in district
10. Leader participation in issues

For the purposes of this study the level of financial effort was categorized as high and low. Typology of power structure was combined so that monopolistic elite and multi-group non-competitive became non-competitive, and multi-group competitive elite and segmented pluralism became competitive. While districts were referred to throughout the study as "competitive" and "non-competitive" districts, it was assumed that the reader would understand that the terms were descriptive of the pattern of decision-making in the districts (Appendix B).

Analysis of Data

After the data from all districts were summarized, the following steps were employed to analyze them in terms of the problem of the present study:

Step 1

A. A Chi Square test was employed to determine if high and low fiscal effort are independent of the distribution of occupational categories. Separate tests were administered for each of the following:

   1. All leaders identified in each district

   2. The fifteen highest ranked influentials in each district

   3. The six highest ranked influentials in each district

B. A comparison was made of each occupational category between high and low effort districts, to determine the nature of the difference and its significance. This was accomplished by the use of a test of the significance of the difference between proportions.

C. The same comparisons were made by states.

Step 2

A. A Chi Square test was employed to determine if typology of power structure was independent of the distribution of occupations. Separate tests again were administered, using all leaders in each district, the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district, and the six highest ranked leaders in each district.

B. A comparison was made of each occupational category between competitive and non-competitive districts to determine the nature of the difference and its significance. This was accomplished by the use of a test of the significance of the difference between proportions.

C. The same comparisons were made by states.

Step 3

The following selected personal characteristics of the leaders were compared to determine if there were any significant differences between:

A. High and low effort districts

B. Competitive and non-competitive power structures

C. Differences among states

1. Ages of leaders
2. Years' residence in district
3. Years of formal education
4. Number of children
5. School status of children
6. Original residence
7. Membership in organizations
8. Adult relatives in district
9. Church membership
10. Leader participation in issues

The appropriate statistical test of the difference of means or the difference of proportions was used for each of these comparisons.

The Organization of the Study by Chapters

I. Introduction

- A. Purpose of the study
- B. Statement of the problem
- C. Need for the study
- D. Delimitations
- E. Definition of terms
- F. Review of related research
- G. Hypotheses
- H. Procedures
  1. Summary of data
  2. Steps in the analysis of data

II. The Study of Occupational Patterns of Leaders

- A. The relationship of occupational patterns of leaders to level of local financial effort for education
- B. The relationship of occupational patterns of leaders to typology of power structure

III. The Study of Personal Characteristics of Leaders

- A. The relationship of personal characteristics of leaders to level of local financial effort for education
- B. The relationship of personal characteristics of leaders to typology of power structure

IV. Summary

- A. Results
- B. Conclusions and implications

CHAPTER II

THE STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL PATTERNS OF LEADERS

The study of occupations of community leaders in a power system can afford some important insights into the structure of the system. Those in the influential positions in a community are there because they possess certain resources which afford them a base of power. The occupational position of an individual is frequently his most important source of power. It has been generally assumed that leaders in the economic sphere, for example, derive their power from their control over economic factors related to business and industry. The politician, on the other hand, derives his power from his access to governmental processes and resources, where decisions must often be formally sanctioned. The most important resource available to the specialist is his expertise.

Occupation alone does not determine the extent of influence a person possesses in community decision-making. Leadership ability, money, time, interest, and many other factors undoubtedly play their part in varying degrees among the leaders. In any case, occupation is one of the most visible and probably the most consistent base of power which an influential leader possesses.

Occupations of the leaders in the twenty-four selected districts in this study were categorized as economic, political, and specialist, as suggested by Presthus (1964). Leaders were placed in one of these

categories on the basis of their major sphere of influence. This resulted in the placement of some individuals in the economic category who in fact held some type of political office. For example, a businessman may have been a school board member or a city council member, but his major source of power or influence came from his business associations. He was therefore placed in the economic category. It might be argued that the arbitrary categorization employed here tends to underrate the influence of political forces in the distribution of power. It has been suggested, for example, that a fourth category, the economic-political leader, should be employed (Marsh, 1965). However, this division tends to further fragment the picture, while not really coming to grips with the problem of the major source of power of these individuals. It is the opinion of the writer that the three-division classification is more useful, and that perhaps one should interpret the results of the present study with the thought in mind that the political influence is possibly somewhat stronger than indicated.

Since this study was conducted as part of USOE Project #2842, the code names assigned to the twenty-four selected districts were retained. The assignment of districts as high or low effort and as competitive or non-competitive was accepted on the basis of the research done in the previous studies. Table 1 lists the names of the districts, by states, and their assignment in terms of local financial effort for education and type of power structure.

Table 2 shows the distribution of occupations in each district, by number and by per cent.

TABLE 1

DISTRICTS, BY STATES, SHOWING LEVEL OF FISCAL EFFORT AND TYPE OF POWER STRUCTURE

District	State	Level of Effort	Type Power Structure
Logan	Florida	High	Competitive
Everest	Florida	High	Competitive
McKinley	Florida	High	Competitive
Rainier	Florida	Low	Non-Competitive
Whitney	Florida	Low	Non-Competitive
Shasta	Florida	Low	Non-Competitive
Andrews	Georgia	High	Competitive
Ford	Georgia	High	Non-Competitive
Scott	Georgia	High	Non-Competitive
Anderson	Georgia	Low	Competitive
Carter	Georgia	Low	Competitive
Benne	Georgia	Low	Non-Competitive
Cedar	Kentucky	High	Non-Competitive
Pine	Kentucky	High	Competitive
Oak	Kentucky	High	Competitive
Scenic	Kentucky	Low	Non-Competitive
Hub	Kentucky	Low	Non-Competitive
Farm	Kentucky	Low	Non-Competitive
Allwyn	Illinois	High	Non-Competitive
Camelot	Illinois	High	Competitive
Brookston	Illinois	High	Non-Competitive
Marlboro	Illinois	Low	Non-Competitive
Winston	Illinois	Low	Non-Competitive
Tareyton	Illinois	Low	Non-Competitive

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF LEADERS BOTH WITHIN AND BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, SHOWING NUMBER AND PER CENT BY DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

District	Total Leaders	Economic No.	Economic %	Political No.	Political %	Specialist No.	Specialist %
Florida							
Logan	37	26	70.3	9	24.3	2	5.4
Everest	39	17	43.6	13	33.3	9	23.1
McKinley	36	19	52.8	14	38.9	3	8.3
Whitney	32	20	62.5	6	18.8	6	18.7
Rainier	36	22	61.1	10	27.8	4	11.1
Shasta	36	26	72.2	5	13.9	5	13.9
	216	130	60.2	57	26.4	29	13.4
Georgia							
Carter	31	18	58.1	4	12.9	9	29.0
Andrews	25	11	44.0	12	48.0	2	8.0
Anderson	26	14	53.8	8	30.8	4	15.4
Benne	24	18	75.0	4	16.7	2	8.3
Scott	27	14	51.9	6	22.2	7	25.9
Ford	22	5	22.7	10	45.5	7	31.8
	155	80	51.6	44	28.4	31	20.0
Kentucky							
Pine	39	17	43.6	17	43.6	5	12.8
Oak	39	16	41.0	16	41.0	7	18.0
Cedar	35	21	60.0	6	17.1	8	22.9
Scenic	28	14	50.0	7	25.0	7	25.0
Hub	31	16	51.6	9	29.0	6	19.4
Farm	30	19	63.3	8	26.7	3	10.0
	202	103	51.0	63	31.2	36	17.8
Illinois							
Camelot	28	21	75.0	3	10.7	4	14.3
Marlboro	36	20	55.6	8	22.2	8	22.2
Winston	33	20	60.6	2	6.1	11	33.3
Tareyton	30	18	60.0	4	13.3	8	26.7
Brookston	31	23	74.2	1	3.2	7	22.6
Allwyn	27	16	59.3	3	11.1	8	29.6
	185	118	63.8	21	11.3	46	24.9
Totals	758	431	56.9	185	24.4	142	18.7

Summary of Occupational Patterns for All Districts

There were 758 identified leaders in the twenty-four selected districts, of which 56.9 per cent were economic leaders, 24.4 per cent were political leaders, and 18.7 per cent were specialist leaders. It would appear that the economic leaders dominated community power systems. However, when hierarchical comparisons were made among the leaders, some important changes occurred. The comparison of the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district, and again of the six highest ranked leaders in each district, revealed that the proportion of economic leaders decreased slightly with increasing rank, the proportion of political leaders increased substantially with increasing rank, and the proportion of specialist leaders decreased noticeably with increasing rank. These comparisons are shown in Table 3.

Subsequent sections of this chapter investigated the possibility that occupational patterns of leaders differed between high and low effort districts and between competitive and non-competitive districts.

The Relationship of Occupational Patterns of Leaders to Level of Local Financial Effort for Education

In order to determine if a relationship existed between the occupational patterns of the leaders and local financial effort for education, the data were arranged in a contingency table as shown in Table 4. The obtained Chi Square was significant at the 0.05 level indicating dependency of occupational patterns to high and low effort.

To explore more exact associations, the significance of the difference of proportions between high and low effort districts was tested

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS FOR ALL DISTRICTS BY NUMBER AND PER CENT

Leadership Category	Number and Per Cent of Leaders					
	6 Highest in Each District		15 Highest in Each District		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Economic	78	54.17	198	55.00	431	56.86
Political	54	37.50	113	31.39	185	24.41
Specialist	12	8.33	49	13.61	142	18.73
Total	144	100.00	360	100.00	758	100.00

TABLE 4

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF NUMBER OF LEADERS IN EACH OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
High	206	110	69	385
Low	225	75	73	373
Totals	431	185	142	758

Chi Square = 7.34
($X^2_{.05}$ = 5.991, df = 2)

for each occupational category. The results are shown in Table 5. It is apparent from these results that there were significantly greater numbers of political leaders in the high effort districts than in the low effort districts. The difference in economic leaders was also statistically significant. It can be seen that a smaller proportion of economic leaders was found in the high effort districts than in the low effort districts. Very little difference existed in the proportion of specialist leaders in the two categories of districts.

The data of Table 5 relate to numbers of leaders without any reference to their rankings in the power structure. Although the majority of leaders were in the economic category in both high and low level districts, a listing of the average rank of leaders by districts indicates that the political leaders ranked higher in most districts. This measure, as shown in Table 6, has limited value since it does not account for the number of leaders involved in a categorical rank. To consider the ranking of leadership as well as the number of leaders, the data were arranged in contingency tables to test the dependence of occupational categories on high and low effort, first using the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district and then the six highest ranked leaders in each district, with the results being shown in Table 7A and 7B. The Chi Square values obtained were not significant. By cursory observation it may be seen that the distribution of leadership followed the same general pattern as when all leaders were considered. This is shown in Table 8.

Perhaps of more importance in Table 8 is the vertical distribution which shows that the proportion of political leaders in both high

TABLE 5

THE DIFFERENCE OF PROPORTIONS OF EACH OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY IN HIGH AND LOW LEVEL DISTRICTS

Leadership Category	High Level	Low Level	z test	p
Economic	53.5	60.3	-1.89	<0.05
Political	28.6	20.1	2.75	<0.005
Specialist	17.9	19.6	-0.58	

TABLE 6

AVERAGE RANK* OF LEADERS BY OCCUPATION IN HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

District	Economic (%ile)	Political (%ile)	Specialist (%ile)
High Effort			
Andrews	40.0	53.8	53.0
Ford	41.5	67.5	28.2
Scott	45.9	67.6	35.0
Cedar	52.6	57.9	31.3
Pine	53.9	43.7	48.0
Oak	44.7	52.0	50.5
McKinley	40.8	63.0	31.5
Everest	53.5	53.7	32.7
Logan	46.0	66.3	23.0
Allwyn	53.5	33.3	41.5
Camelot	45.4	62.5	52.3
Brookston	48.7	32.3	50.5
Low Effort			
Whitney	50.7	69.5	20.1
Rainier	53.7	47.3	24.4
Shasta	41.4	71.2	63.1
Anderson	41.1	62.7	43.3
Benne	47.0	61.5	29.2
Carter	47.4	48.4	50.4
Winston	56.1	62.2	32.2
Tareyton	58.6	22.9	38.2
Marlboro	47.7	63.2	36.5
Hub	43.9	62.0	40.1
Farm	43.7	57.9	52.3
Scenic	42.3	68.6	39.8

*Expressed as a percentile ranking by groups.

TABLE 7A

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS
OF FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS IN EACH
DISTRICT BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
High Effort	92	63	25	180
Low Effort	106	50	24	180
Totals	198	113	49	360

Chi Square = 2.50
($X^2_{.05}$ = 5.991, df = 2)

TABLE 7B

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS
OF SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS IN EACH
DISTRICT BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
High Effort	36	31	5	72
Low Effort	42	23	7	72
Totals	78	54	12	144

Chi Square = 1.98
($X^2_{.05}$= 5.991, df = 2)

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort*	Low Effort*	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	50.0	58.3	-1.00	N. S.
Political	43.1	31.9	1.40	N. S.
Specialist	6.9	9.8	-0.63	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	51.1	58.9	-1.49	N. S.
Political	35.0	27.8	1.48	N. S.
Specialist	13.9	13.3	0.18	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	53.5	60.3	-1.89	<0.05
Political	28.6	20.1	2.75	<0.005
Specialist	17.9	19.6	-0.58	N. S.

*Given in per cents.

and low effort districts increased as the level of influence increased. That is, when all leaders were considered, 28.6 per cent were classified as political, but when the six highest ranked were considered, 43.1 per cent were political. The increase in the low effort districts was from 20.1 per cent to 31.9 per cent. The proportion of political leaders among the higher ranked leaders as compared to the proportion in the total membership was found to be significantly greater, regardless of the type of district.

While the proportion of economic leaders decreased only slightly in both high and low effort districts, the proportion of specialist leaders showed substantial decreases in both types of districts. These decreases were significant at the 0.05 level.

A further analysis of the relationship of occupational categories to level of local financial effort for education was made by states. Table 9 provides the data in per cents. An examination of the distribution of economic leaders shows that in Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky the per cent of economic leaders was higher in the low effort districts than in the high effort districts, even though the difference was statistically significant only in Georgia. By showing a larger per cent of economic leaders in high effort districts than in low effort districts, Illinois failed to follow the pattern of the other three states.

In the analysis of political leaders, Illinois again failed to follow the pattern of the other three states. Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky showed a greater proportion of political leaders in the high effort districts than in the low effort districts, with the differences

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES TO LEVEL OF FINANCIAL EFFORT FOR EDUCATION, BY STATES

	High Effort*	Low Effort*	z test of difference	P
Economic				
Florida	55.4	65.4	-1.50	N. S.
Georgia	40.5	61.7	-2.64	<0.005
Kentucky	47.8	55.1	1.03	N. S.
Illinois	69.8	58.6	1.58	N. S.
Political				
Florida	32.1	20.2	2.77	<0.005
Georgia	37.8	19.8	2.48	<0.01
Kentucky	34.5	27.0	1.14	N. S.
Illinois	8.1	14.1	-1.28	N. S.
Specialist				
Florida	12.5	14.4	-0.41	N. S.
Georgia	21.6	18.5	0.48	N. S.
Kentucky	17.7	18.0	-0.06	N. S.
Illinois	22.1	27.3	-0.82	N. S.

*Given in per cents.

in Florida and Georgia being statistically significant. Not only was this circumstance reversed in Illinois, but the percentage of political leaders, especially in high effort districts, was noticeably lower than in the other three states.

It can be noted that the proportion of specialist leaders was not significantly different between high and low effort districts in any of the four states. The per cent of specialist leaders in the low effort districts in Illinois was somewhat higher than it was in the other states.

Tables 10A, 10B, 10C, and 10D provide a breakdown of the occupational distribution by states in high and low effort districts when considering the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district and the six highest ranked leaders in each district. As the comparison in each state narrows to the top leaders the smaller size of the sample affects the test for significance, but the general pattern is apparent. The proportional number of political leaders in most districts increased as discrimination was made as to rank, while the proportional number of specialist leaders decreased. The pattern of the economic leaders was not consistent, particularly due to the predominance of economic leaders in Illinois, in both high and low effort districts.

The Relationship of Occupational Patterns of Leaders to Typology of Power Structure

Table 11 is a contingency table of the distribution of occupational categories of the leaders within each type of power structure in the district. The two variables were shown to be statistically

TABLE 10A

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH FLORIDA DISTRICT, TO HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	44.4	55.6	-0.67	N. S.
Political	55.6	38.9	1.00	N. S.
Specialist	0	5.5	-	-
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	48.9	64.4	-1.48	N. S.
Political	44.4	26.7	1.75	<0.05
Specialist	6.7	8.9	-0.39	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	55.4	65.4	-1.50	N. S.
Political	32.1	20.2	1.98	<0.025
Specialist	12.5	14.4	-0.41	N. S.

TABLE 10B

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH GEORGIA DISTRICT, TO HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	27.8	66.6	-2.32	<0.01
Political	61.1	16.7	2.73	<0.005
Specialist	11.1	16.7	-	-
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	33.3	53.3	-1.91	<0.05
Political	51.1	31.1	1.93	<0.05
Specialist	15.6	15.6	0	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	40.5	61.7	-2.64	<0.005
Political	37.8	19.8	2.48	<0.01
Specialist	21.6	18.5	0.48	N. S.

TABLE 10C

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH KENTUCKY DISTRICT, TO HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	50.0	27.8	1.37	N. S.
Political	44.5	55.6	0.66	N. S.
Specialist	5.5	16.6	-	-
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	51.1	48.9	0.21	N. S.
Political	37.8	37.8	0	N. S.
Specialist	11.1	13.3	-0.32	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	47.8	55.1	-1.03	N. S.
Political	34.5	27.0	1.14	N. S.
Specialist	17.7	18.0	-0.06	N. S.

TABLE 10D

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH ILLINOIS DISTRICT, TO HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	77.8	83.3	-0.48	N. S.
Political	11.1	16.7	-0.73	N. S.
Specialist	11.1	0	-	-
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	71.1	68.8	0.24	N. S.
Political	6.7	15.6	-1.35	N. S.
Specialist	22.2	15.6	0.80	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	69.8	58.6	1.58	N. S.
Political	8.1	14.1	-1.28	N. S.
Specialist	22.1	27.3	-0.82	N. S.

TABLE 11

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF NUMBER OF LEADERS IN EACH OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY IN ALL DISTRICTS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE POWER STRUCTURES

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
Non-Competitive	272	89	97	458
Competitive	159	96	45	300
Totals	431	185	142	758

Chi Square = 16.72

($X^2_{.05}$ = 5.991, df=2)

dependent. In order to evaluate specific relationships, a comparison was made for each occupational category between competitive and non-competitive districts. The results, using a z test of the significance of the difference of two proportions, are shown in Table 12.

The proportion of economic leaders was somewhat higher in the non-competitive districts than it was in the competitive districts, a difference which was statistically significant. The political leaders, on the other hand, had a proportionately larger representation in the competitive districts than they did in the non-competitive ones, a difference which was statistically significant. The specialist leaders were represented significantly more in the non-competitive districts. They also surpassed the number of political leaders in these districts.

The need to make some discrimination of leadership which takes into account the rank or level of influence of the leaders was pointed out in an earlier section. The average rank of leaders in each occupational category by type of power structure is shown for each district in Table 13. Again the limitations of this table should be noted. It simply points out the average rank of leaders without regard to the number in each category. Its purpose is to indicate the inadequacy of exclusive consideration of leaders in terms of numbers only. It may be seen in the table that political leaders rank higher in most districts, in spite of the numerical superiority of economic leaders.

In order to further investigate the relationship of the distribution of occupational categories to competitive and non-competitive

TABLE 12

THE DIFFERENCE OF PROPORTIONS OF EACH OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY IN ALL DISTRICTS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE POWER STRUCTURES

Leadership Category	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test	p
Economic	53.0%	59.4%	-1.74	<0.05
Political	32.0%	19.4%	3.96	<0.0005
Specialist	15.0%	21.2%	-2.15	<0.025

TABLE 13

AVERAGE RANK* OF LEADERS BY OCCUPATION IN COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

District	Economic (%ile)	Political (%ile)	Specialist (%ile)
Competitive			
Andrews	40.0	53.8	53.0
Pine	53.9	43.7	48.0
Oak	44.7	52.0	50.5
McKinley	40.8	63.0	31.5
Everest	53.5	53.7	32.7
Logan	46.0	66.3	23.0
Camelot	45.4	62.5	52.3
Anderson	41.1	62.7	43.3
Carter	47.4	48.4	50.4
Non-Competitive			
Ford	41.5	67.5	28.2
Scott	45.9	67.6	35.0
Cedar	52.6	57.9	31.3
Allwyn	53.5	33.3	41.5
Brookston	48.7	32.3	50.5
Whitney	50.7	69.5	20.1
Rainier	53.7	47.3	24.4
Shasta	41.4	71.2	63.1
Benne	47.0	61.5	29.2
Winston	56.1	62.2	32.2
Tareyton	58.6	22.9	38.2
Marlboro	47.7	63.2	36.5
Hub	43.9	62.0	40.1
Farm	43.7	57.9	52.3
Scenic	42.3	68.6	39.8

*Expressed as a percentile ranking by groups.

districts, the data were arranged in contingency tables, utilizing first the fifteen highest ranked leaders and then the six highest ranked leaders in each district. These are shown in Table 14A and 14B. The dependency between these two factors was significant for the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district but not significant when the six highest were considered.

Further investigation of the nature of the relationship was made by testing the difference of proportions of leaders in each occupational category, using the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders in each district. The results are shown in Table 15.

It is clearly evident from the data of Table 15 that the economic leaders dominated the non-competitive districts significantly more than they did the competitive districts when the fifteen highest ranked leaders were considered. Conversely, the political leaders were significantly more predominant in the competitive districts than they were in the non-competitive. The specialists, who were significantly greater in numbers in the non-competitive districts than they were in the competitive districts when all leaders were considered, no longer reflected such a difference when only the fifteen highest ranked leaders were considered.

A vertical view of the table indicates that there was no important change in the proportion of economic leaders in either type of district when the comparison was made among the fifteen highest ranked leaders. This was not true, however, of the political leaders. There was a noticeable increase in the proportion of political leaders in

TABLE 14A

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS OF FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT BY NON-COMPETITIVE AND COMPETITIVE POWER STRUCTURES

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
Non-Competitive	137	57	31	225
Competitive	61	56	18	135
Totals	198	113	49	360

Chi Square = 10.80

($X^2_{.05}$ = 5.991, df = 2)

TABLE 14 B

CONTINGENCY TABLE OF DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS OF SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT BY NON-COMPETITIVE AND COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Economic	Political	Specialist	Total
Non-Competitive	53	31	6	90
Competitive	25	23	6	54
Totals	78	54	12	144

Chi Square = 2.38

($X^2_{.05}$ = 5.991, df = 2)

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	46.3	58.9	-1.47	N. S.
Political	42.6	34.4	0.98	N. S.
Specialist	11.1	6.7	0.93	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	45.2	60.9	2.90	<0.0025
Political	41.5	25.3	3.20	<0.001
Specialist	13.3	13.8	-0.13	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	53.0	59.4	-1.74	N. S.
Political	32.0	19.4	3.96	<0.0005
Specialist	15.0	21.2	-2.15	<0.025

competitive and in non-competitive districts when the comparison was made of the fifteen highest ranked leaders. When the comparison was made at the level of the six highest ranked leaders, the proportion of political leaders again increased slightly in the competitive districts and more noticeably in the non-competitive districts. The proportion of specialist leaders decreased as the higher ranking leaders were considered, with the difference in the non-competitive districts reflecting a significant drop.

These comparisons reflect the need to compare the distribution of occupations in terms of the level of influence of the leaders as well as the number of leaders. In general, the exclusive use of numbers of leaders as a comparative measure tended to underrate the influence of the political leader and to overrate the influence of the specialist.

A further analysis of the relationship of the distribution of occupational categories to type of power structure was made by states. Tables 16A, 16B, 16C, and 16D provide the information in per cent of leaders in each category.

Data presented earlier in this chapter confirmed the existence of proportionately more economic leaders in non-competitive districts. When all leaders were considered by states, this circumstance was true for Florida and Kentucky, but there was practically no difference in Georgia, and the opposite effect was found in Illinois. However, when the fifteen highest ranked leaders were considered, the general pattern of more economic leaders in non-competitive districts held true in all four states. It also held true for three of the four states when the six highest ranked leaders were considered, Georgia being the exception.

TABLE 16A

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH FLORIDA DISTRICT TO COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	44.4	55.6	-0.67	N. S.
Political	55.6	38.9	1.00	N. S.
Specialist	0	5.5	-	-
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	48.9	64.4	-1.48	N. S.
Political	44.4	26.7	1.75	<0.05
Specialist	6.7	8.9	-0.39	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	55.4	65.4	-1.48	N. S.
Political	32.1	20.2	1.98	<0.025
Specialist	12.5	14.4	-0.41	N. S.

TABLE 16B

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH GEORGIA DISTRICT TO COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	50.0	44.4	0.34	N. S.
Political	27.8	50.0	-1.37	N. S.
Specialist	12.2	5.6	0.57	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	37.8	48.9	-1.06	N. S.
Political	44.4	37.8	0.64	N. S.
Specialist	17.8	13.3	0.59	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	52.4	50.7	0.21	N. S.
Political	29.3	27.4	0.26	N. S.
Specialist	18.3	21.9	0.56	N. S.

TABLE 16C

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH KENTUCKY DISTRICT TO COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	33.3	41.7	-0.55	N. S.
Political	58.3	45.8	0.71	N. S.
Specialist	8.4	12.5	-0.38	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	40.0	55.0	-1.34	N. S.
Political	46.7	33.3	1.24	N. S.
Specialist	13.3	11.7	0.22	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	42.3	56.5	-1.97	<0.025
Political	42.3	24.2	2.70	<0.005
Specialist	15.4	19.3	-0.71	N. S.

TABLE 16D

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH ILLINOIS DISTRICT TO COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	66.6	83.3	-1.00	N. S.
Political	16.7	13.3	0.22	N. S.
Specialist	16.7	3.4	1.30	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	66.7	70.7	-0.31	N. S.
Political	13.3	10.7	0.29	N. S.
Specialist	20.0	18.6	0.13	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	75.0	61.8	1.34	N. S.
Political	10.7	11.4	-0.11	N. S.
Specialist	14.3	26.8	-1.41	N. S.

It was found earlier in this chapter that the proportion of political leaders in all competitive districts was significantly higher than it was in the non-competitive districts. The analysis by states shows that this difference existed primarily in Florida and Kentucky. There was very little difference in Georgia or Illinois. When the data were narrowed to the fifteen highest ranked leaders, the general pattern of more political leaders in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts held for all four states, although the differences were not statistically significant. At the level of the six highest ranked leaders the percentage of political leaders was greater in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts in three of the four states, although these differences were not statistically significant.

The specialist leaders represented such a small proportion of the totals in all districts that differences between competitive and non-competitive districts were not very important. It is noteworthy, however, that in the competitive districts in Illinois the specialist leaders were rather highly ranked, and generally outnumbered the political leaders. This is rather interesting in view of the unusually high per cent of economic leaders among the leadership in Illinois districts.

As a general pattern it can be said that the proportion of economic leaders decreased slightly as higher ranked individuals were considered, the notable exception being the Illinois non-competitive districts. The proportion of political leaders generally increased, with the exception of Georgia competitive districts. The proportion of specialist leaders generally decreased as higher ranked leaders were considered, except in Illinois competitive districts.

Summary

The distribution of occupations among the leaders of the twenty-four selected districts was studied in terms of their relationship to level of financial effort for education and type of power structure. The following were found to be statistically significant.

The Relationship of Occupational Patterns to Level of Financial Effort for Education

1. The distribution of occupations of all leaders in the twenty-four districts was found to be related to high and low local fiscal effort for education by use of Chi Square as a test of independence. (Chi Square = 7.34, df = 2.)

2. There was a significant difference in the proportion of political leaders found in high and low effort districts, with the larger proportion found in the high effort districts. ($z = 2.75$.)

3. The proportion of political leaders in high effort districts and in low effort districts increased significantly when only the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared to all the leaders. ($z = 2.21$ for low effort districts.) ($z = 2.31$ for high effort districts.)

4. The proportion of specialist leaders in high effort districts and in low effort districts decreased significantly when only the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared to all the leaders. ($z = 1.99$ for low effort districts.) ($z = 2.32$ for high effort districts.)

5. When compared by states, the following were found to be statistically significant:

a. In Florida, the proportion of political leaders in high effort districts was higher than in low effort districts when all leaders were compared. ($z = 1.98$.)

b. In Georgia, the proportion of political leaders in high effort districts was higher than in low effort districts when all leaders were compared and when the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared. ($z = 2.48$ for all leaders.) ($z = 2.73$ for top six leaders.)

c. In Georgia, the proportion of economic leaders in low effort districts was higher than in high effort districts when all leaders were compared. ($z = 2.64$.)

The Relationship of Occupational Patterns to Type of Power Structure

1. The distribution of occupations of all leaders in the twenty-four selected districts was found to be related to competitive and non-competitive types of power structures by use of Chi Square as a test of independence. (Chi Square = 16.72, df = 2.)

2. There was a significant difference in the proportion of political leaders found in competitive and non-competitive districts, with the larger proportion found in the competitive districts. ($z = 3.96$.)

3. There was a significant difference in the proportion of specialist leaders found in competitive and non-competitive districts, with the larger proportion found in non-competitive districts. ($z = -2.15$.)

4. The dependence of the distribution of occupations on type of power structure was found to be significant when the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district were compared. (Chi Square = 10.80, df = 2.)

5. The proportion of economic leaders in non-competitive districts was significantly higher than in competitive districts when the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district were considered. ($z = 2.90$.)

6. The proportion of political leaders in competitive districts was significantly higher than in non-competitive districts when the fifteen highest ranked leaders in each district were considered. ($z = 3.20$.)

7. The proportion of political leaders in non-competitive districts increased significantly when only the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared to all leaders. ($z = -2.96$.)

8. The proportion of specialist leaders in non-competitive districts decreased significantly when only the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared to all the leaders. ($z = 3.22$.)

9. When compared by states, the following were found to be statistically significant:

a. In Florida, there was a significantly larger proportion of political leaders in the competitive districts than in the non-competitive. ($z = 1.98$.)

b. In Kentucky, there was a significantly larger proportion of political leaders in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts. ($z = 2.70$.)

c. In Kentucky, there was a significantly larger proportion of economic leaders in non-competitive districts than in competitive districts. ($z = -1.97$.)

General Patterns

The following general patterns seemed to characterize the three occupational groups, although some of the trends were not great enough to be statistically significant.

1. The following general patterns seemed to characterize the economic leaders:

a. Economic leaders represented a slight majority when all leaders in all districts were combined (56.9 per cent).

b. Economic leaders were slightly more highly represented in non-competitive districts (59.4 per cent) than in competitive districts (53.0 per cent), and somewhat more highly represented in low effort districts (60.3 per cent) than in high effort districts (53.5 per cent).

c. Economic leaders maintained their proportionate numbers in low effort and non-competitive districts as discrimination was made as to rank, but decreased somewhat under these circumstances in high effort and competitive districts.

d. Economic leaders dominated in Illinois in much stronger fashion than was the case in the other three states.

2. The following general patterns seemed to characterize the political leaders:

a. Political leaders did not achieve a significant majority in any of the four classifications of districts, but were clearly more highly represented in high effort and competitive districts.

b. Political leaders increased their proportional representation in all four categories of districts as discrimination was made as to rank in the power structure.

c. Political leaders had the highest average rank of the three categories of leaders.

d. Political leaders represented a higher proportion of all leaders than did specialist leaders except in Illinois where the specialist leaders outnumbered the political leaders.

3. The following general patterns seemed to characterize the specialist leaders:

a. Specialist leaders represented only 18.7 per cent of all leaders, with representation slightly higher in low effort districts and significantly higher in non-competitive districts.

b. The average rank of the specialist leaders was lowest of the three categories of leaders. This was especially evident in the decreasing proportion of specialist leaders as the highest fifteen and highest six leaders in each district were considered.

CHAPTER III

THE STUDY OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERS

This chapter investigates the relationship of each of a number of personal characteristics of the community leaders in the twenty-four districts to high and low financial effort for education, and to competitive and non-competitive power structures. Data for these comparisons were obtained from Interview Guide B (Appendix C).

When data for all districts were combined, the following were found to be characteristic of leaders:

1. The average age of all leaders was 52.65 years.

2. The leaders had resided in their districts an average of 35.73 years, and 49 per cent spent their entire lives in their districts.

3. The leaders had an average of 15.7 years of formal education.

4. The leaders had an average of 2.42 children, 57 per cent of whom were still in school. Of the children, 11.51 per cent were attending, or had attended at one time, a private school.

5. The Chamber of Commerce was the only organization in which more than half of the leaders held membership.

6. Leaders participated, on the average, in 51 per cent of the identified issues in the districts.

7. Over 90 per cent of the leaders were members of Protestant churches, with 70 per cent holding membership in the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian church.

8. The number of adult relatives of leaders residing in the district showed wide variation. The average number, excluding the leader's own household, was 15.22.

The Relationship of Personal Characteristics to Level of Local Financial Effort for Education

Ages of Leaders

The average age of leaders in high and low effort districts is summarized in Table 17. Complete data for all districts are included in Appendix D. It is apparent from Table 17 that the average age of leaders in high and low effort districts was virtually the same. The same was true of the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders in each district.

A further comparison of the ages of leaders was made by considering their occupational classifications. Table 18 summarizes the average ages of economic, political, and specialist leaders in high and low level districts. The results reveal that the economic, political, and specialist leaders in high effort districts were about the same age as their counterparts in low effort districts. This was true when all leaders were considered, when the fifteen highest ranked were considered, and when only the six highest ranked were compared. However, a comparison of the ages of the three categories of leaders reveals that the political leaders and specialist leaders were younger than the economic leaders. The differences were significant at the 0.05 level. This difference held for both high and low effort districts. When the fifteen highest leaders in each district were compared, the political leaders were again significantly younger than the economic leaders, the difference being especially large in the low effort districts. At this level, however, the specialist leaders were not significantly younger

TABLE 17

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW FINANCIAL EFFORT

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	52.04	53.30	-0.71	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	52.51	52.99	-0.42	N. S.
All Leaders	52.56	52.74	-0.23	N. S.

TABLE 18

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	55.50	55.60	-0.04	N. S.
Political	48.21	48.59	-0.14	N. S.
Specialist	51.50	52.83	-0.22	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	54.17	55.14	-0.64	N. S.
Political	49.16	47.87	0.67	N. S.
Specialist	53.50	53.25	0.09	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	54.14	54.89	-0.71	N. S.
Political	50.85	50.10	0.46	N. S.
Specialist	50.66	51.26	-0.32	N. S.

than the economic leaders. When the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared, the political leaders were significantly younger than the economic leaders. The specialist leaders were younger than the economic leaders, but the difference was not statistically significant.

When the average age of leaders was compared by states, without regard to occupation, there were no important differences between high and low effort districts in any of the states. The data, reported in Table 19, reveal that the oldest average age was found in Illinois, the state which was most strongly represented by economic leaders. It is interesting to note that the highest average age anywhere on the table was among the six highest ranked leaders in Illinois, especially in low effort districts.

Years' Residence in the District

Complete data regarding the number of years leaders have resided in their districts are contained in Appendix E. The comparison of years' residence in the district by high and low fiscal effort is shown in Table 20. Leaders in low effort districts had resided in their districts significantly longer than had leaders in high effort districts. However, the difference decreased somewhat as higher ranked leaders were compared. In both high and low effort districts, the average number of years' residence increased with rank in the power structure. This increase was especially true in the high effort districts where the increase was statistically significant when all leaders were compared with the six highest ranked.

TABLE 19

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	50.68	49.50	*	
Georgia	48.94	52.28	*	
Kentucky	51.72	52.00	*	
Illinois	56.72	59.50	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	51.36	53.69	-1.00	N. S.
Georgia	51.36	49.27	0.93	N. S.
Kentucky	52.23	52.67	-0.20	N. S.
Illinois	54.73	56.57	-0.82	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	51.35	51.50	-0.10	N. S.
Georgia	51.17	50.26	0.54	N. S.
Kentucky	52.80	54.50	-1.00	N. S.
Illinois	55.99	54.86	0.71	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 20

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW FINANCIAL EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	38.50	42.36	1.26	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	34.83	39.60	2.37	<0.01
All Leaders	32.71	38.96	4.35	<0.0005

Table 21 summarizes the average number of years' residence in the district by states. The pattern of longer residence of leaders in low effort districts was true except for Georgia. The increase in years' residence with higher ranking leadership was not found in Kentucky, where the higher ranked leaders had not been in the district as many years. The increase in Florida was slight.

When occupational categories were considered, the general pattern of longer residence in low effort districts was maintained for all three categories. Table 22 provides this comparison. When the ranks of the leaders were compared, it was found that the higher ranked political leaders had lived in their districts no longer than the average for all political leaders. The same was true of specialist leaders in high effort districts. The most striking change was among specialist leaders in low effort districts, where tenure in the district was significantly longer among the higher ranked leaders, and also significantly longer than specialist leaders in high effort districts.

Table 22 also reveals that when all leaders were considered there were no important differences in length of residence between economic and political leaders, but when the higher ranked leaders were considered the political leaders had somewhat less tenure. It should be recalled that the average age of political leaders was somewhat less than that of economic leaders, which is consistent with the findings in Table 22. The specialist leaders, as might be expected, had resided a significantly fewer number of years in their districts than had the economic and political leaders, with the interesting exception of the

TABLE 21

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	27.41	36.61	-1.61	N. S.
Georgia	43.00	39.94	0.58	N. S.
Kentucky	33.88	41.24	-1.12	N. S.
Illinois	43.28	52.12	-1.43	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	28.00	39.86	-3.65	<0.0005
Georgia	38.00	34.33	1.01	N. S.
Kentucky	36.45	41.63	-1.15	N. S.
Illinois	37.77	43.12	-1.20	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	25.14	35.66	-4.65	<0.0005
Georgia	34.18	35.03	-0.30	N. S.
Kentucky	35.98	44.99	-2.95	<0.0025
Illinois	36.72	42.38	-1.79	<0.05

TABLE 22

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	39.18	43.73	-1.15	N. S.
Political	35.59	36.86	-0.25	N. S.
Specialist	21.33	44.43	-2.48	<0.01
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	37.09	41.14	-1.54	N. S.
Political	36.73	37.76	-0.29	N. S.
Specialist	20.80	32.79	-2.36	<0.01
All Leaders				
Economic	34.79	41.36	-3.52	<0.0005
Political	36.01	40.24	-1.59	N. S.
Specialist	21.26	29.27	-2.45	<0.01

high ranking specialists in low effort districts, who had the longest tenure of any group in either type of district.

Years of Formal Education

Table 23 indicates a higher educational level among leaders in high effort districts than in low effort districts, a pattern which was consistent at all three levels of leader rankings. However, the differences were not large in terms of years of formal education, and the importance of the statistical difference found is questionable.

When the leaders were compared by occupations, the general pattern of more formal education among leaders in high effort districts was still apparent. Table 24 indicates that the pattern was consistent for all categories except the six highest ranked political leaders in each district. It can also be seen that while there was very little difference in the educational level of economic and political leaders, the specialist leaders had a significantly higher level of education than either of the other two categories.

A further comparison of the years of formal education of leaders was made by states. Table 25 indicates that the general pattern of a higher level of education among leaders in high effort districts was followed in three of the four states. Illinois failed to follow the pattern, in large part because of the unusually high level of education among the specialist leaders in the low effort districts in that state.

Complete data on years of formal education are contained in Appendix F.

TABLE 23

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION AMONG THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	15.81	15.46	0.71	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	15.87	15.25	2.01	<0.025
All Leaders	15.90	15.32	2.42	<0.01

TABLE 24

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	15.48	15.20	*	
Political	15.03	15.65	*	
Specialist	17.40	16.71	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	15.40	14.70	*	
Political	15.88	15.51	*	
Specialist	17.48	16.79	*	
All Leaders				
Economic	15.20	14.64	1.88	<0.05
Political	15.74	15.04	1.37	N. S.
Specialist	17.59	17.63	0.07	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 25

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
Florida	15.36	14.27	2.48	<0.01
Georgia	15.64	15.28	0.78	N. S.
Kentucky	16.50	14.84	3.35	<0.0005
Illinois	15.99	16.91	-1.88	<0.05

Children of Leaders

A comparison of the average number of children of leaders in high and low effort districts is made in Table 26. The leaders in high effort districts had a slightly higher average number of children than those in low effort districts when all leaders were compared. However, the difference widened as higher ranked leaders were compared, until it reached a point of statistical difference with the six highest ranked leaders in each district.

The same general pattern was found when the comparison was made by states. Table 27 shows that there were more children per leader among the high effort districts in all four states when the six highest ranked leaders were compared. The fact that the leaders in high effort districts had more children would lead one to believe that they would have more children in school. Table 28 shows that such was the case. It can also be seen that the difference was greater when the six highest ranked leaders were compared.

Table 29 shows the average number of leaders' children in school, by states. Leaders in high effort districts in all states had a greater average number of children in school than did leaders in low effort districts.

A comparison of the proportion of leaders' children who attended private schools was made between high and low effort districts. Table 30 makes it clear that there were considerably more children of leaders attending private schools in high effort districts than in low effort districts. Furthermore, the proportion of leaders' children attending

TABLE 26

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	2.94	2.46	2.05	<0.025
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	2.58	2.49	0.60	N. S.
All Leaders	2.48	2.42	0.64	N. S.

TABLE 27

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS IN EACH DISTRICT, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	2.73	2.61	*	
Georgia	2.89	2.47	*	
Kentucky	2.83	2.29	*	
Illinois	3.28	2.47	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	2.74	2.50	*	
Georgia	2.30	2.40	*	
Kentucky	2.58	2.40	*	
Illinois	2.70	2.66	*	
All Leaders				
Florida	2.52	2.40	0.54	N. S.
Georgia	2.39	2.18	0.95	N. S.
Kentucky	2.57	2.53	0.04	N. S.
Illinois	2.39	2.63	-1.19	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 28

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	1.87	1.36	1.94	<0.05
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	1.58	1.40	1.17	N. S.
All Leaders	1.52	1.34	1.60	N. S.

TABLE 29

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	2.07	1.72
Georgia	1.83	1.47
Kentucky	1.83	1.41
Illinois	1.78	.82
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	1.95	1.45
Georgia	1.30	1.60
Kentucky	1.60	1.28
Illinois	1.52	1.27
All Leaders		
Florida	1.53	1.34
Georgia	1.46	1.37
Kentucky	1.58	1.21
Illinois	1.26	1.28

TABLE 30

PER CENT OF CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	17.24	7.05	2.95	<0.0025
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	15.94	11.49	1.88	<0.05
All Leaders	12.66	10.25	1.56	N. S.

private schools in high effort districts increased as higher ranked leaders were considered, reaching a statistically significant difference among the six highest ranked leaders, when compared to the low effort districts.

The same comparison is shown by states in Table 31. The greater proportion of the six highest ranked leaders' children in private schools was found primarily in Illinois and Kentucky. In fact, in Florida and Georgia the greater per cent of private school attendance was found in the low effort districts, although the difference was much less pronounced than in Kentucky and Illinois. A complete summary of data on children of leaders is given in Appendix G.

Original Residence of Leaders

The proportion of leaders who were native residents of their districts was much higher in low effort districts. Table 32 shows that the difference was statistically significant when all leaders were compared and when the fifteen highest ranked leaders were compared. The difference also reached statistical significance among the six highest ranked leaders, in spite of the smaller sample. It can also be seen that the per cent of native residents in high effort districts was greater among higher ranked leaders, while there was no such increase in the low effort districts.

The comparison of original residence in high and low effort districts was broken down by states in Table 33. The pattern of a greater proportion of native residents in low effort districts was maintained

TABLE 31

PER CENT OF CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	9.76	12.77
Georgia	5.77	9.52
Kentucky	23.53	2.56
Illinois	27.11	2.38
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	10.00	15.00
Georgia	9.09	8.74
Kentucky	21.62	5.21
Illinois	21.84	16.51
All Leaders		
Florida	9.88	10.17
Georgia	7.55	9.30
Kentucky	15.35	5.34
Illinois	17.36	14.95

TABLE 32

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	44.44	59.72	-1.84	<0.05
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	37.77	61.11	-4.43	<0.0005
All Leaders	36.20	60.27	-6.52	<0.0005

TABLE 33

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS AMONG THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	27.78	55.56	*	
Georgia	72.22	50.00	*	
Kentucky	27.78	61.11	*	
Illinois	50.00	72.22	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	20.00	75.56	*	
Georgia	53.33	44.44	*	
Kentucky	37.78	57.78	*	
Illinois	40.00	66.67	*	
All Leaders				
Florida	21.43	71.15	-7.33	<0.0005
Georgia	41.89	43.03	-0.14	N. S.
Kentucky	45.71	64.10	-2.47	<0.01
Illinois	39.02	59.60	-2.76	<0.005

*Not computed because of small sample.

with a statistical difference for three of the four states. In Georgia there was very little difference. The pattern was also maintained in three states when higher ranked leaders were compared. Georgia showed an opposite trend, with a greater number of native residents in high effort districts when higher ranked leaders were compared.

One further analysis of leaders who were native residents of their districts was made to determine their distribution in terms of occupational categories. Table 34 shows that among the native residents of their districts the economic leaders and specialist leaders were proportionately greater in low effort districts than in high effort districts, while the political leaders were proportionately greater in high effort districts. That is, the politician in a high effort district was more likely to be a native resident than the politician in a low effort district, while the opposite was true for economic and specialist leaders. The same general pattern was maintained among the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders. Complete data on original residence are reported in Appendix H.

Membership in Organizations

The only organization which contained over 50 per cent of the leaders in a majority of districts was the Chamber of Commerce. In only one district of the twenty-four was this not the case. The information is given in Table 35. It can be seen that there was no important difference between high and low effort districts in organizational membership. Majority membership in at least one other organization was the

TABLE 34

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS AMONG THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	50.00	53.49	*	
Political	50.00	37.21	*	
Specialist	0	9.30	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	51.47	61.82	*	
Political	45.59	30.00	*	
Specialist	2.94	8.18	*	
All Leaders				
Economic	54.07	63.13	-1.68	<0.05
Political	37.04	23.50	2.73	<0.005
Specialist	8.89	13.37	-1.28	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 35

MEMBERSHIP OF MORE THAN 50 PER CENT OF THE LEADERS IN ORGANIZATIONS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

Organization	Number of High Effort Districts with over 50% Membership	Number of Low Effort Districts with over 50% Membership
Chamber of Commerce	11	12
Country Club	5	3
Farm Bureau	3	0
Democratic Party	3	1
Kiwanis	1	0
Elks	2	1
Rotary	1	1
CDA	1	1
Committee of 100	2	2
Yacht Club	1	0
American Legion	1	0
Regal Club	0	1
Industrial Foundation	0	1
Scouting	0	1
American Cancer Society	0	1
Red Cross	0	1
Concert Association	0	1
Social Club	0	1
Masonic	2	1

case in all but two districts, both of which were high effort districts. There was, however, no other organization which was listed in a majority of districts. The Country Club was listed in five low effort and three high effort districts, and no other organization was listed more than four times.

A measure of the influence of organizations was made by asking leaders to nominate those organizations which they deemed to be influential in the community. Table 36 lists the organizations which were nominated by at least 2 per cent of the leaders. The Chamber of Commerce was the only organization nominated by a majority of leaders in both high and low effort districts. Various industrial and civic groups were ranked next, followed closely by the traditional civic clubs. The rankings were very similar for high and low effort districts, except that more organizations were listed by leaders in high effort districts. However, the small per cent of nominations makes this appear rather unimportant. Summary data for all districts are reported in Appendix I.

Church Membership

No important differences were found between church membership of leaders in high and low effort districts. Table 37 gives a summary of membership. Perhaps most noticeable in this table is the similarity of rankings. The Methodists and Baptists were more highly represented in low effort districts, which was offset by more Catholics and Episcopalians in high effort districts. Since these two denominations are well known for their private schools, it would seem to agree with earlier

TABLE 36

RANKINGS BY PER CENT OF INFLUENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS BY LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

High Effort		Low Effort	
Per Cent of Leaders Nominating	Name of Organization	Per Cent of Leaders Nominating	Name of Organization
55.84	Chamber of Commerce	52.81	Chamber of Commerce
8.05	Civic Development	11.79	Industrial Develpt.
7.27	Industrial Develpt.	10.99	Civic Development
7.01	Assoc. of Industries	10.45	Rotary
5.45	Jaycees	9.65	Jaycees
5.45	Kiwanis	9.11	Kiwanis
5.19	Org. of Top Exec.*	5.89	Lions
4.93	Rotary	4.02	Farm Bureau
4.41	PTA	3.75	Assoc. of Industries
4.15	League Women Voters	2.68	Taxpayers Assoc.*
4.15	Democratic Party	2.41	Agriculture Assoc.
3.90	Mills Foundation*		
3.11	Lions		
3.11	United Fund		
2.59	Property Owners		

*Named in only one district.

TABLE 37

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF LEADERS BY
HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

High Effort		Low Effort	
Per Cent Membership	Church	Per Cent Membership	Church
22.38	Methodist	31.01	Methodist
19.19	Baptist	29.28	Baptist
19.19	Presbyterian	18.26	Presbyterian
13.08	Episcopal	4.63	Catholic
8.13	Catholic	4.63	Episcopal
4.94	Christian	4.05	Christian
2.90	Jewish	2.89	Jewish
2.90	Congregational	1.73	None
2.03	Lutheran	1.15	Lutheran
1.45	Unitarian	1.15	Unitarian
1.16	None	1.22	Miscellaneous
2.65	Miscellaneous		

results which showed that leaders in high effort districts more often send their children to private schools.

Such a possible relationship is further fortified by the analysis of church membership by states as shown in Table 38. It may be recalled that the higher proportion of children in private schools was found to center in Kentucky and Illinois. Table 37 indicates that there were substantially more Catholic and Episcopalian leaders in high effort districts.

Adult Relatives in District

Table 39 shows the average number of relatives per leader in high and low effort districts. It is clear that the leaders in low effort districts had many more relatives living in the district than did the leaders in high effort districts, regardless of rank in the power structure. However, the range was so great that no statistical comparisons were made.

Table 40 compares the number of relatives of leaders in high and low effort districts by states. Leaders in Kentucky low effort districts had the most relatives in their districts, while the lowest number of relatives appeared among the high and low effort districts of Illinois. Appendix J gives the complete data on relatives of leaders.

Participation in Issues

In order to measure the participation of leaders in issues, the criteria used by Marsh (1965) and others were followed, in which involvement was based on one or more of the following: (1) recognition

TABLE 38

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP* OF LEADERS BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND STATES (%)

High Effort		Low Effort	
Florida		Florida	
Baptist	21.78	Baptist	33.98
Methodist	19.80	Methodist	26.21
Presbyterian	15.84	Presbyterian	22.33
Episcopal	15.84	Episcopal	8.74
Jewish	5.94		
Georgia		Georgia	
Methodist	36.11	Methodist	44.30
Baptist	30.56	Baptist	37.97
Presbyterian	22.22	Presbyterian	11.39
Catholic	5.55		
Kentucky		Kentucky	
Presbyterian	18.81	Baptist	39.74
Methodist	17.82	Methodist	35.90
Baptist	16.38	Christian	11.54
Episcopal	16.83	Presbyterian	5.13
Christian	12.87		
Catholic	10.89		
Illinois		Illinois	
Presbyterian	18.29	Presbyterian	31.76
Methodist	15.85	Methodist	20.00
Episcopal	12.19	Catholic	15.29
Catholic	9.76	Jewish	10.59
Baptist	6.10	Baptist	5.88
Congregational	6.10	Episcopal	5.88

*5% or above.

TABLE 39

AVERAGE NUMBER OF RELATIVES PER LEADER WHO RESIDED IN THE DISTRICT, EXCLUDING LEADER'S OWN HOUSEHOLD, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	6.53	15.44*
16 Highest Ranked Leaders	6.36	13.34*
All Leaders	6.38	15.29*

*Leaders in one district had more relatives than in all others combined. Adjustment of the mean was made by assigning to this district the average of the other 11 districts. The actual mean number of relatives in low effort districts was 24.36 for all leaders, 29.41 for the fifteen highest ranked, and 46.31 for the six highest ranked.

TABLE 40

AVERAGE NUMBER OF RELATIVES PER LEADER WHO RESIDED IN THE DISTRICT, EXCLUDING LEADER'S OWN HOUSEHOLD, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	5.11	15.56
Georgia	9.89	12.17
Kentucky	4.59	37.12*
Illinois	6.06	4.18
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	4.63	15.21
Georgia	7.44	9.18
Kentucky	10.44	28.56*
Illinois	3.20	8.02
All Leaders		
Florida	3.26	20.52
Georgia	5.44	8.48
Kentucky	13.24	29.82*
Illinois	2.77	7.27

*See note on Table 39. Unadjusted figures: 63.99, 89.35, and 157.18.

by two or more leaders other than the leader being ranked as being involved; (2) recognition by the leader being ranked as being involved with an explanation of how he was involved (voting not included); (3) recognition of self-involvement and recognition of involvement by one other leader; and (4) subjective recognition of involvement by the researcher.

The per cent of participation in issues was calculated as the sum of the number of leaders involved in each issue divided by the product of the number of leaders and the number of issues. Table 41 shows the per cent of participation by leaders in high and low effort districts. There was very little difference when all leaders were compared, but among the fifteen highest ranked leaders there was significantly more participation among leaders in high effort districts. There was also greater participation in high effort districts when the six highest ranked leaders were compared, again a difference which was statistically significant. It is also apparent that the per cent of participation in both high and low effort districts increased with leader rank. This was to be expected since involvement in issues was one of the criteria used to rank leaders.

The comparison of participation by states is shown in Table 42. In Florida low effort districts participation was significantly higher than in the high effort districts at all levels, while in Georgia participation was remarkably higher among leaders in high effort districts. In Kentucky not much difference occurred, while participation in Illinois was significantly higher in high effort districts, but only when

TABLE 41

PER CENT OF PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ISSUES BY THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	79.10	73.56	1.79	<0.05
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	68.26	62.64	2.56	<0.01
All Leaders	51.88	50.69	0.74	N. S.

TABLE 42

PER CENT OF PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ISSUES BY THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY HIGH AND LOW EFFORT DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	High Effort	Low Effort	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	60.42	75.00	-2.34	<0.01
Georgia	94.44	43.33	6.81	<0.0005
Kentucky	89.58	93.06	-0.78	N. S.
Illinois	85.56	86.67	-0.23	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	52.22	65.00	-3.10	<0.0001
Georgia	85.56	37.78	9.71	<0.0005
Kentucky	74.58	76.11	-0.36	N. S.
Illinois	73.33	74.22	-0.21	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	37.00	53.62	-6.20	<0.0005
Georgia	73.99	34.44	9.91	<0.0005
Kentucky	55.59	55.34	0.05	N. S.
Illinois	62.56	54.95	2.45	<0.01

no ranking of leaders was made. Complete data on participation in issues for all districts are given in Appendix K.

The Relationship of Personal Characteristics to Typology of Power Structure

Ages of Leaders

The average age of leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts is summarized in Table 43. Complete data for all districts are included in Appendix D. There was not much difference in the ages of leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts, although leaders in non-competitive districts were slightly older. The same was true of the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders in each district.

A further comparison of the ages of leaders was made by occupational categories. Table 44 shows that the economic, political, and specialist leaders were about the same age in competitive districts as in non-competitive districts when all leaders were compared. As higher ranked leaders were compared, the specialists in non-competitive districts were somewhat older, as were the economic leaders in competitive districts. Comparison of the occupational categories in this table shows that the economic leaders in both competitive and non-competitive districts were significantly older than either the political or specialist leaders when all leaders were compared.

When the average age of leaders was compared by states, there were no important differences between competitive and non-competitive

TABLE 43

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	51.76	53.22	-0.86	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	51.77	53.37	-1.37	N. S.
All Leaders	52.09	53.22	-1.38	N. S.

TABLE 44

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	57.00	54.88	0.87	N. S.
Political	46.02	50.17	-1.52	N. S.
Specialist	52.83	54.50	-0.23	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	55.36	54.58	0.48	N. S.
Political	48.35	48.89	-0.27	N. S.
Specialist	50.06	55.31	-2.02	<0.025
All Leaders				
Economic	53.63	55.06	-1.32	N. S.
Political	50.82	49.25	0.96	N. S.
Specialist	49.50	51.67	-1.16	N. S.

districts. The data, reported in Table 45, show that the leaders in Illinois were somewhat older than in the other states. The highest average age on the table appears among the six highest ranked leaders in Illinois competitive and non-competitive districts.

Years' Residence in the District

Complete data regarding the number of years leaders had resided in their districts are contained in Appendix E. The comparison of years' residence in the district by competitive and non-competitive districts is shown in Table 46. When all leaders were compared, those in non-competitive districts had resided there significantly longer than those in competitive districts. The same was true when the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared. A vertical comparison shows that in non-competitive districts the six highest ranked leaders had resided in their districts significantly longer than had the average leader in those districts. This was not true in the competitive districts.

Leaders were also compared on the residence variable by occupational categories. Table 47 indicates that when all leaders were compared, the economic and political leaders had significantly longer residence in the non-competitive districts, while there was little difference in the specialist category. The same general pattern held when the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders were compared. It also is apparent that the specialist leaders had resided in their districts for a fewer number of years than either the

TABLE 45

AVERAGE AGES OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	50.68	49.50	*	
Georgia	51.17	50.06	*	
Kentucky	51.17	51.77	*	
Illinois	57.83	58.12	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	51.36	53.69	-1.00	N. S.
Georgia	49.27	51.32	-0.93	N. S.
Kentucky	53.83	51.54	1.04	N. S.
Illinois	53.79	55.98	-0.60	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	51.35	51.50	-0.10	N. S.
Georgia	50.63	50.91	-0.16	N. S.
Kentucky	53.84	53.37	0.28	N. S.
Illinois	54.50	55.43	-0.39	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 46

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	34.89	42.66	-2.49	<0.01
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	37.65	38.87	-0.59	N. S.
All Leaders	32.86	37.69	-3.31	<0.0005

TABLE 47

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	39.25	42.71	-0.79	N. S.
Political	32.35	43.17	-2.25	<0.025
Specialist	28.83	38.00	-0.72	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	37.14	40.29	-1.13	N. S.
Political	34.53	41.15	-1.92	<0.05
Specialist	25.78	29.61	-0.73	N. S.
All Leaders				
Economic	33.74	40.66	-3.59	<0.0005
Political	34.32	41.54	-2.77	<0.005
Specialist	25.56	26.85	-0.37	N. S.

economic leaders or political leaders. These differences were significant for all leaders and for the fifteen highest ranked leaders.

A further comparison of years' residence in the district was made by states. Table 48 makes it clear that the higher average number of years' residence in the non-competitive districts was most pronounced in Florida, with very little difference noted in Georgia and Illinois. However, as higher ranked were considered, the general pattern of longer residence in non-competitive districts was found in all states.

Years of Formal Education

Table 49 shows that there was practically no difference between the leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts in average number of years of formal education attained. When the fifteen highest ranked leaders were compared, a slightly higher average appeared for leaders in competitive districts.

Years of education of the leaders were compared by occupational categories in Table 50. When all leaders were compared, the political leaders were somewhat higher in competitive districts, but the difference was not found among the fifteen highest ranked leaders and the six highest ranked leaders. It can be seen from the table that the specialist leaders were considerably higher in years of formal education than either the economic or political leaders. This was true in both competitive and non-competitive districts.

A further comparison of the educational level of the leaders was made by states in Table 51. In Florida and Kentucky the leaders in

TABLE 48

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS' RESIDENCE IN DISTRICT OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	27.41	36.61	-1.61	N. S.
Georgia	38.83	44.11	-1.01	N. S.
Kentucky	36.33	38.23	-0.29	N. S.
Illinois	41.33	48.86	-0.85	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	27.53	39.86	-3.80	<0.0005
Georgia	35.84	36.41	-0.16	N. S.
Kentucky	38.69	38.93	-0.05	N. S.
Illinois	43.36	39.76	0.61	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	25.14	35.66	-4.65	<0.0005
Georgia	35.19	33.99	0.42	N. S.
Kentucky	38.87	42.35	-1.11	N. S.
Illinois	38.96	38.73	0.05	N. S.

TABLE 49

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION AMONG THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	15.74	15.52	0.41	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	15.81	15.42	1.26	N. S.
All Leaders	15.65	15.74	-0.39	N. S.

TABLE 50

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	14.87	15.50	*	
Political	15.78	15.53	*	
Specialist	17.17	16.83	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	15.36	14.88	*	
Political	15.81	15.67	*	
Specialist	17.61	17.06	*	
All Leaders				
Economic	15.02	14.83	0.62	N. S.
Political	15.70	14.84	1.74	<0.05
Specialist	17.51	17.75	-0.42	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 51

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	15.31	14.75	*	
Georgia	14.85	15.62	*	
Kentucky	16.83	15.33	*	
Illinois	16.67	16.04	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	15.37	13.93	*	
Georgia	15.22	15.62	*	
Kentucky	17.03	15.41	*	
Illinois	16.29	16.17	*	
All Leaders				
Florida	15.36	14.27	2.48	<0.01
Georgia	15.31	15.61	-0.65	N. S.
Kentucky	16.59	14.85	3.51	<0.0005
Illinois	16.12	16.53	-0.62	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

competitive districts were significantly higher in the average number of years of formal education attained than the leaders in non-competitive districts. There was little difference in Georgia and Illinois. It can be noted that the comparison of higher ranking leaders had very little effect.

Children of Leaders

A comparison of the average number of children of leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts is made in Table 52. The leaders in competitive districts had a slightly higher average number of children than those in non-competitive districts. However, the difference widened as higher ranked leaders were compared. At the level of the six highest ranked leaders there were significantly more children per leader in competitive than in non-competitive districts.

The same general pattern was found when the comparison was made by states. Table 53 shows that there were more children per leader among the competitive districts in all four states when higher ranked leaders were compared.

Table 54 compares the leaders of competitive and non-competitive districts by the number of children in school. There were more children per leader in school in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts, a difference which was statistically significant when the fifteen highest and six highest ranked leaders were compared. When the same comparisons were made by states, the pattern was generally consistent throughout the four states. These comparisons are shown in Table 55.

TABLE 52

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	2.92	2.40	2.12	<0.025
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	2.65	2.47	1.17	N. S.
All Leaders	2.51	2.40	0.98	N. S.

TABLE 53

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	2.73	2.61	*	
Georgia	2.71	2.67	*	
Kentucky	2.92	2.39	*	
Illinois	4.00	2.66	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	2.74	2.50	*	
Georgia	2.36	2.34	*	
Kentucky	2.76	2.35	*	
Illinois	3.00	2.62	*	
All Leaders				
Florida	2.52	2.40	0.54	N. S.
Georgia	2.15	2.42	-1.20	N. S.
Kentucky	2.82	2.28	2.47	<0.01
Illinois	2.69	2.48	0.71	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 54

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	t test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	2.00	1.40	3.48	<0.0005
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	1.73	1.35	2.22	<0.025
All Leaders	1.55	1.36	1.62	N. S.

TABLE 55

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	2.07	1.72
Georgia	1.82	1.50
Kentucky	1.75	1.57
Illinois	2.83	0.90
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	1.95	1.45
Georgia	1.60	1.36
Kentucky	1.62	1.35
Illinois	1.79	1.27
All Leaders		
Florida	1.68	1.42
Georgia	1.39	1.46
Kentucky	1.62	1.28
Illinois	1.35	1.32

A comparison was made of the children of leaders who attend private schools. Table 56 shows that there were significantly more children of leaders in private schools in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts. This same comparison was made by states in Table 57. It can be seen that the difference was in Kentucky and Illinois. It is interesting to note the remarkable difference among higher ranked leaders in these two states.

Original Residence of Leaders

The proportion of leaders who were native residents of their districts was much higher in the non-competitive districts. Table 58 shows that the differences were significant when all leaders were compared, when the fifteen highest ranked leaders were compared, and when the six highest ranked leaders were compared. There was a slight increase in the per cent of native residents in non-competitive districts as higher ranked leaders were compared, but this was not true in the competitive districts.

The comparison of original residence of leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts was broken down by states in Table 59. The pattern of a greater proportion of native residents in non-competitive districts was maintained in all states and at all levels, with the greatest difference found in Florida. The differences were not large in other states except among the six highest ranked leaders in the districts.

One further analysis of leaders who were native residents of their districts was made in terms of occupational categories. Table 60

TABLE 56

PER CENT OF CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	18.49	8.81	2.75	<0.005
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	16.62	12.02	1.89	<0.05
All Leaders	13.36	10.14	2.07	<0.025

TABLE 57

PER CENT OF CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	9.76	12.77
Georgia	6.52	8.33
Kentucky	31.43	3.64
Illinois	37.50	10.39
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	10.00	15.00
Georgia	8.08	9.71
Kentucky	28.75	4.72
Illinois	30.95	16.67
All Leaders		
Florida	9.88	10.17
Georgia	8.72	8.14
Kentucky	19.42	4.44
Illinois	20.00	15.00

TABLE 58

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	37.04	61.11	-2.80	<0.005
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	38.52	56.00	-3.21	<0.001
All Leaders	36.52	55.68	-5.08	<0.0005

TABLE 59

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	27.78	55.56	*	
Georgia	50.00	72.22	*	
Kentucky	33.33	50.00	*	
Illinois	33.33	66.67	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	20.00	75.56	*	
Georgia	48.89	48.89	*	
Kentucky	46.67	48.33	*	
Illinois	46.67	54.67	*	
All Leaders				
Florida	21.43	71.15	-7.33	<0.0005
Georgia	40.74	44.44	-0.46	N. S.
Kentucky	51.35	55.05	-0.49	N. S.
Illinois	46.15	50.97	-0.45	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

TABLE 60

PER CENT WHO WERE NATIVE RESIDENTS OF THEIR DISTRICTS OF THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	50.00	52.73	*	
Political	40.00	43.64	*	
Specialist	10.00	3.64	*	
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Economic	46.15	62.70	*	
Political	44.23	32.54	*	
Specialist	9.62	4.76	*	
All Leaders				
Economic	51.40	63.27	-2.09	<0.025
Political	35.51	25.71	1.87	<0.05
Specialist	13.08	11.02	0.56	N. S.

*Not computed because of small sample.

shows that a significantly greater proportion of economic leaders were native residents of their districts in non-competitive districts than in competitive districts. This difference also existed among the fifteen highest ranked leaders, but largely disappeared when the six highest ranked leaders were compared. On the other hand, a greater proportion of political leaders were born in their districts among the competitive districts. Again the difference also existed among the fifteen highest ranked leaders and largely disappeared when the six highest ranked leaders were compared.

Specialist leaders who were born in their districts were found slightly more often in competitive districts, the difference being larger when higher ranked leaders were compared.

Membership in Organizations

Table 61 lists the organizations in which the leaders showed at least 50 per cent membership. The number of competitive and non-competitive districts in which at least 50 per cent of the leaders held membership is shown for each organization. It can be readily seen that the Chamber of Commerce was the only organization which was prominent in a majority of districts. The Country Club was listed for two competitive districts and six non-competitive districts. No other organization was listed in more than four of the twenty-four districts.

When leaders were asked to nominate those organizations which they deemed to be influential in the community, the Chamber of Commerce again emerged far in front of all the rest. Table 62 gives the results

TABLE 61

MEMBERSHIP OF MORE THAN 50 PER CENT OF THE LEADERS IN ORGANIZATIONS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

Organization	Number of Competitive Districts with over 50% Membership	Number of Non-Competitive Districts with over 50% Membership
Chamber of Commerce	11	12
Country Club	2	6
Farm Bureau	1	2
Democratic Party	1	3
Kiwanis	0	1
Elks	1	2
Rotary	0	2
CDA	1	1
Committee of 100	2	2
Yacht Club	0	1
American Legion	1	0
Regal Club	1	0
Industrial Foundation	1	0
Scouting	0	1
American Cancer Society	0	1
Red Cross	0	1
Concert Association	0	1
Social Club	1	0
Masonic	0	3

TABLE 62

RANKINGS BY PER CENT OF INFLUENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS BY LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

Competitive		Non-Competitive	
Per Cent of Leaders Nominating	Name of Organization	Per Cent of Leaders Nominating	Name of Organization
47.33	Chamber of Commerce	61.14	Chamber of Commerce
9.67	Industrial Development	10.48	Rotary
9.33	Civic Development	9.61	Kiwanis
6.67	Assoc. of Industries	9.39	Industrial Develpt.
5.53	League Women Voters	9.17	Jaycees
5.53	Democratic Party	7.21	Civic Development
5.00	Jaycees	6.77	Lions
4.00	PTA	4.59	Assoc. of Industries
3.67	Kiwanis	4.37	Org. of Top Exec.
3.33	Rotary	3.28	Mills Foundation
2.67	Farm Bureau	2.40	United Fund
		2.18	PTA
		2.18	Taxpayers Group

in terms of the per cent of leaders in the district who nominated each organization. Some differences can be noted between competitive and non-competitive districts. In non-competitive districts the Chamber of Commerce was nominated by a larger per cent of the leaders than it was in competitive districts. Another difference was found in the comparatively higher ranking of the traditional civic clubs in the non-competitive districts. Industrial and civic development groups were ranked higher in competitive districts. The League of Women Voters and the Democratic Party, ranked fifth and sixth in the competitive districts, were not ranked in the non-competitive districts.

Church Membership

Table 63 gives a summary of church membership of leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts. No important differences were found. A somewhat smaller per cent of membership in the three major denominations was found in the competitive districts, a difference which was offset by a larger membership in the Episcopal and Catholic churches. This difference agrees with earlier findings when comparisons were made on the basis of financial effort.

Table 64 compares church memberships by type of power structure and by states. There were no important differences between competitive and non-competitive districts in Florida and Georgia. In Kentucky, non-competitive districts show their leaders held membership largely in four Protestant churches, while in the competitive districts there appeared also a substantial membership in the Episcopal and Catholic churches.

TABLE 63

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF LEADERS BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

Competitive		Non-Competitive	
Per Cent Membership	Church	Per Cent Membership	Church
22.34	Methodist	28.67	Methodist
21.63	Baptist	25.12	Baptist
19.15	Presbyterian	17.77	Presbyterian
13.12	Episcopal	5.69	Episcopal
7.80	Catholic	5.21	Catholic
4.96	Christian	4.74	None
2.84	Jewish	4.03	Christian
1.77	Congregational	2.84	Jewish
1.77	None	1.90	Lutheran
1.42	Unitarian	1.18	Congregational
1.06	Lutheran	1.18	Unitarian
2.14	Miscellaneous	1.67	Miscellaneous

TABLE 64

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP* OF LEADERS BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES (%)

Competitive		Non-Competitive	
Florida		Florida	
Baptist	21.15	Baptist	33.98
Methodist	19.23	Methodist	26.21
Presbyterian	15.38	Presbyterian	22.33
Episcopal	15.38	Episcopal	8.74
Georgia		Georgia	
Methodist	37.50	Methodist	43.66
Baptist	37.50	Baptist	30.99
Presbyterian	20.00	Presbyterian	12.68
Kentucky		Kentucky	
Presbyterian	20.83	Baptist	37.38
Episcopal	20.83	Methodist	33.64
Methodist	13.89	Christian	11.21
Christian	13.89	Presbyterian	7.48
Catholic	12.50		
Baptist	11.11		
Illinois		Illinois	
Catholic	26.92	Presbyterian	24.82
Presbyterian	26.92	Methodist	19.15
Episcopal	19.23	Catholic	9.93
Methodist	11.54	None	9.93
		Jewish	8.51
		Episcopal	7.09
		Baptist	6.38

*5% or above.

In Illinois competitive districts the Catholic membership was much higher than in non-competitive districts, while Jewish membership was listed in the non-competitive districts, the only place it appeared significantly in any of the states.

Adult Relatives in District

Table 65 shows the average number of relatives per leader in competitive and non-competitive districts. It is apparent that leaders in non-competitive districts had more relatives living in the district than did leaders in competitive districts. This information agrees with earlier findings of more original residents among the leaders in non-competitive districts, and the greater number of years residence in the district among the leaders in non-competitive districts. However, the range among the districts was so great that no statistical comparison was made.

A comparison of the number of relatives was made by states in Table 66. The pattern of more relatives among leaders in non-competitive districts was found to be primarily in Florida and Kentucky. As noted in an earlier section, the leaders in Illinois had a fewer number of relatives in their districts than did the leaders in the other states.

Participation in Issues

The criteria for participation in issues were given in an earlier section. It was also pointed out that the per cent of participation in issues was calculated as the sum of the number of leaders involved in each issue divided by the product of the number of leaders and the

TABLE 65

AVERAGE NUMBER OF RELATIVES PER LEADER WHO RESIDED IN THE DISTRICT, EXCLUDING LEADER'S OWN HOUSEHOLD, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	7.23	14.49*
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	8.01	12.29*
All Leaders	7.97	12.57*

*Leaders in one district had more relatives than in all others combined. Adjustment of the mean was made by assigning to this district the average of the other 14 districts.

TABLE 66

AVERAGE NUMBER OF RELATIVES PER LEADER WHO RESIDED IN THE DISTRICT, EXCLUDING LEADER'S OWN HOUSEHOLD, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive
6 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	5.11	15.56
Georgia	10.17	11.89
Kentucky	5.92	27.74*
Illinois	6.17	4.93
15 Highest Ranked Leaders		
Florida	4.63	15.21
Georgia	10.14	6.52
Kentucky	12.11	23.26*
Illinois	3.50	5.93
All Leaders		
Florida	3.26	20.52
Georgia	8.64	5.23
Kentucky	16.17	19.93
Illinois	2.19	5.63

number of issues. Table 67 shows the per cent of participation by leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts. At all levels of leaders rankings there was significantly more participation in issues by leaders in non-competitive districts.

The comparison of participation by states is shown in Table 68. The pattern of greater participation in issues by leaders in non-competitive districts was found at all leavels of leader ranking in Florida and Georgia, and when higher rankings were compared in Kentucky. There was not much difference between competitive and non-competitive districts in Illinois, and when all leaders were compared in Kentucky.

Summary

The personal characteristics of leaders in the twenty-four districts were examined in terms of their relationship to typology of power structure and to level of financial effort for education. There was some relationship between the two variables examined; that is, of the twelve low effort districts, ten were also non-competitive. Of the twelve high effort districts, seven were also competitive. For this reason, the results found for one variable often held true for the other variable. The findings relative to each personal characteristic of the leaders are summarized below:

Ages of Leaders

The average age of leaders was about the same when compared by effort and by typology of power structure. The same was true when the

TABLE 67

PER CENT OF PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ISSUES BY THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders	69.39	82.14	-3.77	<0.0005
15 Highest Ranked Leaders	59.39	70.57	-5.06	<0.0005
All Leaders	45.42	56.64	-7.06	<0.0005

TABLE 68

PER CENT OF PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ISSUES BY THE SIX HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, FIFTEEN HIGHEST RANKED LEADERS, AND ALL LEADERS, BY COMPETITIVE AND NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS AND BY STATES

	Competitive	Non-Competitive	z test of difference	P
6 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	60.42	75.00	-2.34	<0.01
Georgia	63.10	69.23	-0.82	N. S.
Kentucky	87.50	93.75	-1.41	N. S.
Illinois	86.67	86.00	0.10	N. S.
15 Highest Ranked Leaders				
Florida	52.22	65.00	-3.10	<0.001
Georgia	56.19	62.05	-1.20	N. S.
Kentucky	72.22	77.50	-1.24	N. S.
Illinois	72.00	74.13	-0.39	N. S.
All Leaders				
Florida	37.00	53.62	-6.20	<0.0005
Georgia	46.52	61.94	-3.83	<0.0005
Kentucky	56.20	54.84	0.43	N. S.
Illinois	60.71	58.09	0.58	N. S.

comparisons were made for each occupational category. However, it was found that political leaders were in general younger than either economic or specialist leaders. Economic leaders were oldest of the three categories. The average age of economic and specialist leaders was higher when higher rankings in the power structure were considered, but this was not true of the political leaders, who in fact were a bit younger among the higher ranked leaders.

The comparison by states indicated generally that the small age difference on the two variables was consistent.

Years' Residence in District

Leaders in non-competitive and low effort districts had resided in their districts for a significantly greater number of years than the leaders in competitive and high effort districts. Those higher in the power structure had also resided in their districts somewhat longer than the average leader. The same general pattern was true for each occupational category. Specialist leaders had resided in their districts for a much shorter period of time than had economic and political leaders, with the interesting exception of the six highest ranked leaders in non-competitive and low effort districts. Here the tenure of the specialist leader was as long as for the other categories. In fact, the tenure of specialist leaders among the six highest ranked leaders in low effort districts was the longest of any group on either variable.

The pattern of longer residence for leaders in low effort districts was consistent in all four states, but the comparison by typology

of power structure showed that the longer residence of leaders in non-competitive districts was found only in Florida and Kentucky, with very little difference in the other two states.

Years of Formal Education

A somewhat higher level of education was found among leaders in high effort districts than in low effort districts. Very little difference was found when the comparison was made by typology of power structure. When comparisons were made for each occupational category, the pattern was generally followed for economic and political leaders, but there was very little difference among specialist leaders when compared on either variable. Specialist leaders, however, had considerably more education than economic and political leaders in all four categories of districts.

When state comparisons were made by high and low effort, the higher level of education among leaders in high effort districts was found in Florida and Kentucky, with little difference in Georgia. More education among leaders in low effort districts was found in Illinois. When the comparison was made on the power structure variable, again Florida and Kentucky showed more education among leaders in competitive districts, with very little difference in Georgia and Illinois.

Children of Leaders

Not much difference in the number of children of leaders was found when all leaders were compared, but when the six highest ranked leaders in each district were compared, the leaders in high effort and

and competitive districts were found to have, on the average, more children than the leaders in low effort and non-competitive districts. This pattern was generally found in the individual states.

When the number of children in school was compared, it was found that leaders in high effort and competitive districts had more children in school. The difference was especially large between competitive and non-competitive districts when higher ranked leaders were compared. Again, this pattern was generally found among the individual states.

When the children of leaders were compared with regard to the number who attended private schools, a greater per cent was found in high effort and competitive districts, with the difference especially large among the six highest ranked leaders in each district. When this circumstance was investigated by states, it was found that it was due primarily to differences in Kentucky and Illinois.

Original Residence of Leaders

The comparison of leaders who were born in their districts revealed that the proportion was much higher in non-competitive and low effort districts than in competitive and high effort districts. This difference was found when all leaders were compared and when higher ranked leaders were compared. It was also found to exist in all four states, with the largest difference found in Florida.

The analysis of original residence by occupational categories indicated that economic leaders in low effort and non-competitive districts were more likely to have been born in their districts than those

in high effort and competitive districts. Political leaders who were born in their districts, on the other hand, were more likely to be found in high effort and competitive districts. Specialist leaders who were born in their districts were found more often in low effort and competitive districts, a circumstance which deviated from the usual pattern of agreement between the variables of effort and typology and power structure.

Membership in Organizations

The Chamber of Commerce was the only organization in any type of district which was found to contain a majority of the leaders in a substantial number of districts. It was listed in all but one of the twenty-four districts. It was also the only organization to which was ascribed a high level of influence by the leaders. A higher per cent of leaders in non-competitive districts nominated the Chamber of Commerce as an influential organization than did leaders in competitive, high effort, and low effort districts. Other influential organizations centered around various industrial and civic development groups and the traditional civic-service clubs. These nominations, however, generally were made by 10 per cent or less of the leaders, as compared to approximately 50 per cent of all leaders who nominated the Chamber of Commerce.

Church Membership

While a large majority of leaders were found to hold membership in three large Protestant churches, it was noted that this majority in

high effort and competitive districts was somewhat smaller than in low effort and non-competitive districts, with the difference accounted for largely by membership in the Episcopal and Catholic churches. When the states were analyzed individually, the larger number of Episcopal and Catholic memberships was found in Kentucky competitive and high effort districts and in all types of Illinois districts.

Adult Relatives in the District

The average number of relatives of leaders, excluding their own household, who lived in the district was much higher in non-competitive and low effort districts. However, the range among the districts was so great that the significance of the difference is questionable. The analysis by states showed that the large difference was attributable to Florida and Kentucky. There was also a small number of relatives in Illinois districts as compared to the other states.

Participation in Issues

When the per cent of leader participation in community issues was compared by high and low effort districts, not much difference was found until the higher ranked leaders were compared. When this was done, a higher per cent of participation was found in the high effort districts.

When participation was compared by type of power structure, however, the per cent of participation in issues was substantially larger in non-competitive districts at all levels of leader ranking.

The analysis by states shows that the higher participation in high effort districts in Georgia and Illinois was offset by the opposite

result in Florida, which accounts for the small difference found among all leaders in the states collectively. The more pronounced difference in the comparison by typology of power structure was due largely to results found in Florida and Georgia.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of selected characteristics of community leaders to typology of power structure and level of local financial effort for education in twenty-four selected school districts. It was assumed that a better understanding of the leaders might provide additional insight into the structure and function of that part of the community social system in which the decision-making process is centered. The kinds of decisions which these leaders make will affect the level of financial support given to education in the community. It was concluded, therefore, that the typology of the community power structure and the level of financial effort for education should be utilized as variables in comparing the characteristics of the community leaders.

Previous studies of these districts [Hopper (1965), Adams (1965), King (1965), and Quick (1965)] have determined the level of local financial effort for education. The methods used by these researchers is summarized in Appendix A. Other studies [Marsh (1965), Easley (1966), Marlantes (1966), Shaffer (1966), Owens (1966), Palmer (1966), and Johns (1967)] have identified the characteristics of the power structures of these districts. The methods used by these researchers is summarized

in Appendix B. For purposes of this study, the four types of power structures were reduced to two: competitive and non-competitive districts.

In designing the research for this study, it was felt that a comparison of leaders should take into account not only the total number of leaders identified as influential in community decision-making, but also their ranking in the power structure as well. It was decided, therefore, that comparisons would be made at three levels of leader rankings, utilizing first the total leadership, then the fifteen highest ranked leaders, and finally the six highest ranked leaders in each district.

Since this study involved districts in four states, it was felt that an analysis of the data should be provided for each state to show the variations among them. Statistical differences found among the states collectively might be considered somewhat more important when they are consistent for all four states. Furthermore, inconsistencies among the states might provide clues for further research to explain variations in patterns of power from district to district.

One important aspect of this study was the relationship between the typology of power structure and the level of financial effort in the district. Scaggs (1967), using a Chi Square test with Yates correction, found a slight statistical relationship between these two variables. From an examination of the districts, it can be seen that of the twelve high effort districts, seven were also competitive. The findings of the present study showed that results of comparisons on the

basis of financial effort frequently agreed with comparisons on the basis of typology of power structure.

Nine hypotheses were proposed in this study. The findings relative to each of the hypotheses are discussed below.

1. There are more political leaders in high effort districts than in low effort districts and also more political leaders in competitive districts. The hypothesis was confirmed. The difference was statistically significant for the following comparisons:

a. By effort

(1) all political leaders in the districts

(2) all leaders in Florida and Georgia

b. By typology of power structure

(1) all political leaders in the districts

(2) fifteen highest ranked leaders in the districts

(3) all leaders in Florida and Kentucky

The relationship was positive, although not statistically significant, for all other comparisons except in Illinois. Here the political leaders were more numerous in non-competitive and low effort districts. However, the data for Illinois did not follow the pattern of the other states in that the number of political leaders in that state was much smaller than in the other three states. The number of political leaders in Illinois was small, regardless of the type of district.

There is no implied cause and effect in these findings. Whether political leadership tends to influence the development of high effort and competitive systems or high effort and competitive systems tend to

afford more opportunity for the development of political influence are questions which cannot be answered from these findings. The results simply establish the relationship in these districts. The value of such knowledge probably lies in its implications for the planning of strategies for educational change, such as the encouragement of the development of political leadership in the districts.

2. Specialists, although less numerous in all types of districts than other types of leaders, are comparatively more numerous in high effort districts and in competitive districts. The number of specialist leaders was the least of the three categories at all levels of leader rankings, ranging from 18.73 per cent of all leaders to 8.33 per cent of the six highest ranked leaders. However, the specialist leaders were found to be less numerous in high effort and competitive districts. When all leaders were compared, only in Georgia was the number of specialist leaders greater in high effort districts. There were no specialist leaders among the six highest ranked leaders in Illinois low effort districts.

When the proportion of specialist leaders in competitive and non-competitive districts was compared, there were significantly more in the non-competitive districts. However, as higher ranked leaders were compared, the difference was less, until at the level of the six highest ranked leaders there were slightly more specialist leaders in competitive districts. This situation was due in large part to the fact that specialist leaders in Illinois competitive districts enjoyed a greater

place of prominence than they did in the other states, even surpassing the number of political leaders.

The hypothesis that specialist leaders would occupy a more important position in competitive and high effort districts was based on a belief that these types of districts represented social systems which would be more open to change and hence more permeable by the specialist. In the twenty-four districts included in this study this belief simply is refuted. The case of Illinois is interesting since it represented the state in which the specialist had the greatest prominence. The economic leaders overwhelmingly dominated the scene in Illinois, and apparently it was somewhat easier for the specialist leaders to obtain positions of power in these districts than it was in other states.

3. The economic leaders are more numerous than other leaders in all types of districts, but they appear less often in high effort districts than in low effort districts, and less often in competitive districts than in non-competitive districts. The hypothesis is confirmed in general, although there were some exceptions. When all leaders were compared by effort in Illinois, the economic leaders were more numerous in high effort and competitive districts, but when the six highest ranked leaders were compared, the situation was reversed. In Georgia, the difference was not great between competitive and non-competitive districts.

Questions naturally arise from these findings as to the meaning of the relationship between the number of economic leaders and non-competitive and low effort districts. The only conclusion which is

justified here is that the two are associated in the districts under study. The unusually large number of economic leaders in Illinois might lead to interesting conjectures regarding the geographical location of the state and the relatively larger incidence of industry than is found in the other states of the study.

4. When higher ranked leaders only are compared, the number of political leaders is proportionately greater in all types of districts, while the proportionate number of specialist leaders is less. This hypothesis was proposed as the result of misgivings about the common practice of equating the number of leaders in an occupational category with the influence of that category. Initial inquiry was made by comparing the average rank of leaders without regard to the number involved. This procedure revealed that political leaders enjoyed the highest average rank of the three occupational categories in the districts under study. At the same time it became apparent that the specialist leaders had a considerably lower average rank than the other two categories.

The comparison of all leaders by occupational categories showed that the proportion of political leaders in all districts combined increased considerably when the fifteen highest ranked leaders were compared, and again when the six highest ranked leaders were compared. At the same time, the proportion of specialist leaders decreased considerably as higher rank was considered. The same results were obtained when the comparisons were made by effort and typology of power structure.

These results were found to be generally consistent throughout the states. One interesting exception was in the competitive districts

of Illinois where the specialist leaders maintained their proportionate numbers fairly well at all levels of leader ranking, indicating that the specialist leaders in those districts enjoyed a rather high average rank.

5. Leaders are younger, have lived in their districts a shorter period of time, and represent a smaller proportion of original residents in high effort districts than in low effort districts, and in competitive districts as compared to non-competitive districts. No important differences in ages were found between leaders in high and low effort districts or in competitive and non-competitive districts. Political leaders, however, were found to be younger than other leaders in all types of districts.

The leaders in high effort and competitive districts had resided in their districts a significantly shorter period of time than had leaders in low effort and non-competitive districts. Specialist leaders had the shortest tenure, except for those among the six highest ranked leaders in low effort districts, who enjoyed the longest tenure of any group.

Among the leaders in high effort and competitive districts the per cent who were originally residents of their districts was much smaller in the high effort and competitive districts than in the low effort and non-competitive districts. The difference was consistent when higher ranked leaders were compared and when comparisons were made by states. However, when comparisons were made by occupational categories, it was found that political leaders from high effort and competitive districts were more likely to have been born in their districts.

Furthermore, specialist leaders who were born in their district were found more often in competitive than non-competitive districts, but also in low effort rather than high effort districts. It is interesting to note that the two "minority groups," the political and specialist leaders, are more often "home-town" products in competitive type systems.

6. There is little difference among leaders in all types of districts in the number of children and school status of children of leaders. Among the six highest ranked leaders in high effort and competitive districts there were more children, but very little difference was found when all leaders were compared. There were more children per leader in school at all levels of leader ranking in the high effort and competitive districts. A greater per cent of leaders' children attended private schools in the high effort and competitive districts, especially among the six highest ranked leaders. This relationship would seem to oppose any idea that the higher incidence of leaders' children in private schools in a district would adversely affect the effort made for public schools.

7. There is little difference in the formal education of leaders in the different types of districts. Leaders in high effort districts had a somewhat higher level of education than those in low effort districts, but there was not much difference when the comparison was made by typology of power structure. Specialist leaders had obtained considerably more formal education than had economic and political leaders.

8. There is little difference in the church membership patterns of leaders in the different types of districts. The rationale for the

study of church membership was based on the possibility that it might reveal cultural patterns which could affect educational decision-making and the typology of power structure. However, no important differences were found. It was noted that a somewhat higher incidence of membership in the Episcopal and Catholic churches was found in high effort and competitive districts, especially in Kentucky and Illinois. The speculative question was raised as to the possible relationship between the larger per cent of leaders' children in private schools in high effort and competitive districts and the larger incidence of membership of leaders in Episcopal and Catholic churches in these districts, since the two churches are well known for their sponsorship of private schools.

9. Leaders have more organizational memberships and participate in community issues more in high effort districts than in low effort districts, and also in competitive districts as compared to non-competitive districts. There was not much difference in organizational memberships among the districts with the exception of non-competitive districts, where organizations were felt by leaders to be somewhat more important than they were in other types of districts. The general implication seemed to be that formal organizations do not play an important part in the power systems. The Chamber of Commerce was the only organization which was prominent in most districts, and it was considered influential by about half of the leaders in all districts combined. It is interesting to note, however, that at least one other organization contained membership of 50 per cent or more of the leaders in each of the districts.

When leader participation in community issues was compared by effort, not much difference was found except among the six highest

ranked leaders, where the participation was greater in high effort districts. The comparison by typology of power structure, however, revealed a higher participation in the non-competitive districts than in the competitive districts, thus refuting the hypothesis.

Conclusions and Implications

The place of a leader in the power structure is no doubt determined by a number of factors. Some of the characteristics of leaders which might help to explain their presence in the system have been investigated in this study. The results indicated that the type of power structure found in a community was related to a number of these characteristics. The same characteristics were compared to the level of local financial effort for education, and again many of the characteristics of leaders were found to be related to this variable.

Viewing a school district as a social system helps to point up the problem of drawing conclusions from the use of selected variables. A social system such as a school district represents an imposing array of elements. Many subsystems are contained within the system. The community leaders are part of the system and each is a part of various networks of overlapping systems. Any attempt to understand the structure of power in a community and the attitudes of community leaders toward the support of education is a formidable task when one considers the complexity of this network of relationships to the various elements of the social system. Power structures do not develop expressly for the purpose of educational decision-making. Community leaders see education

in terms of their own interests, which include not only their personal perceptions of the importance of education but their business interests and broader community interests as well.

The danger of drawing conclusions about community power structures and level of local financial effort for education from a limited number of variables is well recognized by the writer. Perhaps the greatest value of a study such as the present one is the addition to existing literature of more elements which may eventually make up a gestalt, a more complete view, of community social systems, and, in particular, their effect on the financial support of education. The following aspects of this study are proposed as having important implications for further study.

1. There is little doubt that the occupational patterns of leaders had an important relationship to the typology of power structure and level of financial effort in the districts studied. The high average rank of political leaders in most districts is an interesting circumstance, in view of a tendency by some writers to think of political leaders as largely serving at the pleasure of the economic leaders [Hunter (1953) and Thometz (1963)]. The larger incidence of political leaders in high effort and competitive districts, as compared to low effort and non-competitive districts, opens up a number of questions regarding this relationship. Is high effort a result more of political leadership or of the competitive type district? Is the district a competitive type because of the increased political leadership? How can educators plan strategies for educational change in view of these

relationships? These questions are not answered in the present study, but the implication for further investigation is clear.

Specialist leaders represent a particularly important part of a study such as the present one because they include the professional educators in the district. An interesting and somewhat paradoxical pair of results was found in the present study. Although the specialist has more education than other types of leaders and it could be assumed that he would labor for high financial effort for education, he was not found to be any more influential in high effort districts than in low effort districts. And, when the comparison was made in terms of typology of power structure, he was found to be more prominent in the non-competitive districts. In view of these findings, it is interesting to speculate that the level of financial effort for education was influenced in these districts more by non-educational circumstances than by the efforts of professional educators. Ficker (1967) found some evidence of such a circumstance in case studies of financial effort for education in seven school districts. While those findings cannot properly be inferred as related to the results found in the present study, they lend some credibility to the conjecture made for those districts.

2. The consistent pattern of difference found in Illinois would seem to merit further study. Illinois is different from the other three states in several respects, most notably in its development of industry and proximity to other industrial centers. It is interesting to note that the similarity of each state to the overall findings followed a

geographic pattern, with the greatest degree of similarity found in Florida, the southernmost of the four states. The degree of industrial development and geographic patterns would seem, therefore, to be important areas of investigation in the prediction of typology of power structure and educational effort.

Perhaps even more interesting in Illinois was the alteration in the position of the specialist leaders from the pattern found in the other states. The fact that the specialists were found to be more prominent in Illinois, both in numbers and in leader rank, than the political leaders was an interesting departure from the pattern found in the other three states. Future studies dealing with the place of the specialist leader in the community power system should find this circumstance an important area for investigation.

3. Certain personal characteristics of leaders in the selected districts seemed to indicate that competitive and high effort districts would more likely be found where a greater mobility of population had occurred. For example, the leaders in high effort and competitive districts, while about the same age as leaders in low effort and non-competitive districts, had lived in their districts for a much shorter period of time. This result was further emphasized by the finding that the per cent of leaders in high effort and competitive districts who were born in their districts was much lower than in low effort and non-competitive districts. These results would seem to imply that new inputs into a system tended to make it a more open system and more receptive to change. Future studies might very well focus on the process of

change in the local districts, not only of population but other factors as well, such as new industry, new highways and other communication routes, and other inputs which might affect attitudes toward change and innovation. The effect of such inputs on the structure of community power and on the support of education might prove to be a fruitful area of investigation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEASURES OF FINANCIAL EFFORT

Hopper (1965), Adams (1965), King (1965), and Quick (1965) employed the following formulas as measures of financial effort for each year of the 18 years included in their studies:

$$E_1 = \frac{R_1}{W_1}$$

$$E_3 = \frac{R_2}{W_1}$$

Where

R_1 = total local school revenue receipts

R_2 = total local school revenue receipts, less revenue receipts for bonds and bond interest

W_1 = net effective buying income

Other formulas were used to study specific years, but the two shown above were graphed for the 18 year period. The eventual selection of the 24 districts to be used for further study was made on the basis of the 12 highest in effort and the 12 lowest in effort, using 6 from each of the four states.

APPENDIX B

COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL OF INDIVIDUAL POWER

The model of power as developed by Marsh (1965) to indicate the individual power of leaders within the districts includes the following six factors:

1. X_1 = Reputation: Leaders rate each other as to potential power on a scale of zero to five. A rating of five would indicate very strong influence.

2. X_2 = Decisional: Power of the leaders as actually applied in selected community decisions.

3. X_3 = Support-Opposition: Leader ratings of who would support or oppose them on a project or issue.

4. X_4 = Reputation: Guide "A" nominations are ranked. The ability of knowledgeable individuals in the thirteen interest areas to point out those who control power.

5. X_5 = "Verstehen": The external, overall view of the researcher. A subjective approach.

6. X_6 = Influence with state leaders: The ability to secure aid for the community through access and power at the state level.

The Model of Individual Power

Marsh (1965) developed the following formula which combines the components of the model into a sum indicating total power of an individual:

$$Y = A_1X_1 + A_2X_2 + A_3X_3 + A_4X_4 + A_5X_5 + A_6X_6$$

In this formula X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, and X_6 represent independent variables affecting power (Y) and A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, and A_6 represent

variable coefficients of the independent variables. No attempt to calculate the weights of the coefficients was made, though it may be assumed that they will vary. In view of this, Marsh found that the most reliable components of this model for the final ranking of leaders were the variables X_1, X_2, and X_3.

Model for a Power Continuum

Marsh (1965) has identified the power continuum under which the school districts of these studies are placed. His design includes four categories designated as: Monopolistic-Elite, Multi-group Non-competitive Elite, Multi-group Competitive Elite, and Segmented Pluralism. The criteria which determine the placement on the continuum are: cohesion of structure, overlap of structure, issues, ability to define groups, group domination, communication lines, voting participation of the rank and file, regime conflicts, and overlap in group membership.

Criteria for Proposed Power Structure Continuum

Monopolistic-Elite	Multi-Group Non-Competitive Elite	Multi-Group Competitive Elite	Segmented Pluralism
Singular Structure	Dual Structure	Limited Overlapping Structure	Segmented Structure
80-100% overlap on projects	70-80% overlap on projects	50-70% overlap on projects	40-50% overlap on projects
Issues contained	Minor issue competition	Competitive on issues	Segmental competition on issues
Absence of strong well-defined groups over period of more than one election	Incomplete separation of two groups; consensus at times	Two or more well-defined power groups over time	Groups separated due to geographic, ethnic, or economic interests
Communication line upward and downward within group	Communication between group allows consensus on major issues	Communication is with satellites; little with competing group	Communication through political office holders
Voting participation is low; 40-50% or less of registered voters	Voting participation approximates 50% over time	Voting participation approximates 60% over time	Voting participation approximates 65% over time
Membership in groups in general	Much overlap in membership between two competing groups	Cverlap in membership constant as to political and economic	No overlap in group membership except in political areas
Few, if any, regime conflicts	Some regime conflicts between the groups; usually minor	Regime conflicts between at least two distinguishable groups	Competition for public offices based on geographic, ethnic, economic interests, attempt to thus push that area ahead by political means

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE B

_____ County Leadership Study

As a part of our field work at the University of Florida, we are making a study of leadership in several representative Florida counties such as this one. To do this, some information is needed from a number of people like yourself who are actively informed about their county's affairs so that leadership activities can be summarized. Your views will be of great help in this study.

All information given individually will be kept completely confidential. True names are never used in the final analysis nor are your personal opinions revealed individually to anyone else, but it is necessary to ask you for your frank opinions about county affairs and the leadership that may have been involved.

General Information

1. About how long have you lived in _____ County?
   All my life___ No. of years___ If not all of your life, where did you move from most recently? _____
   Age bracket: 25-35___ 36-45___ 46-55___ 56-65___ Over 65___

2. Do you have any children? Yes___ No___ Ages of children_____
   Schools now attended by children: Elementary___ High School___
   College___ Public Schools___ Private Schools (name)_____

3. Occupation_____

4. What amount of regular schooling have you completed?
   Grades 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 College 1 2 3 4
   Graduate Work_____years

5. What organizations are you a member of?

   ___ Chamber of Commerce
   ___ Civitan
   ___ _____ Church
   ___ Committee of 100
   ___ Country Club (name)_____
   ___ Exchange Club
   ___ Kiwanis
   ___ Lions Club
   ___ Masonic Lodge
   ___ PTA
   ___ Rotary
   ___ Sertoma
   ___ Taxpayers Association
   ___ Yacht Club (name)_____
   ___ _____
   ___ _____
   ___ _____

6. Are you an officer or director of any of these organizations now? In the past?
   (Code: M - member; D - director; P, VP, S, T - officer)
   (Circle symbol if office was held in the past.)

7. What organizations have been most influential in solving county-wide problems? (Underline name of organization.) Why?

8. What other major official leadership positions do you now hold? (Elective or appointive offices, offices in firm or corporations, committee or commission appointments, etc.)
   Code: (a) public (b) private

9. What other major official leadership positions have you previously held? Code: (a) public (b) private

10. In this county about how many adult relatives do you have living outside your own household? _____

Extent of Influence of Leaders

In every county some people have more influence in county and city affairs than others. We would like the best judgment of people like yourself about the leadership you believe your fellow citizens are taking in county and city affairs.

We have talked to other persons in the county about leadership. They have given us a list of people whom they consider to be important on county-wide problems. We would like for you also to consider this list of names for us. You may think of someone else to add to this list.

Prelimi-nary List of Lead-ers	Exception-ally Strong County-Wide Influence	Strong County-Wide Influence	Strong Local Community and some County-Wide Influence	Local Community With Little County-Wide Influence	Little Influence
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					
25.					
26.					
27.					
28.					
29.					
30.					

I. Which of the above persons do you feel you could count on most for support if you were interested in putting across a county-wide project? (Circle number before name.) Why?

II. Which of the above persons would be likely to cause you the most trouble in putting across a county-wide project? (Check number before name.) Why?

III. Which of these persons have influence with state leaders through whom they can get things done for the county? (Place an asterisk behind names in the above list.)

IV. Do you consider any of the persons on the list as your "close friends"? (Place check mark after name.)

Projects and Issues

Issue No. 1

1. What persons or groups supported the various candidates?
2. What persons or groups opposed them?
3. Were there conflicting beliefs or philosophies involved in this election? If so, please describe them.
4. What was your position on this issue? How did you support your position?
5. Which leaders did you work closely with on this issue?

Issue No. 2

1. What person or persons initiated action on this proposal?
2. What person or persons opposed them?
3. What was your position on this controversy? How did you support your position?
4. Which leaders did you work closely with on this controversy?

Issue No. 3

1. What person or persons have taken leadership in this controversy?

2. What person or persons have opposed them?

3. What was/is your position on this issue? How did/do you support this issue?

Issue No. 4

1. What person or persons initiated the proposal which brought on this controversy? What other persons were behind the proposal?

2. What person or persons opposed this proposal?

3. What was your position on this issue? How did you support this position.

4. Which leaders did you work closely with on this issue?

Of all the issues, projects, or problems with which you have been concerned, which one did you work the hardest to support or oppose?

Please give us a detailed account of how you influenced this decision. Whom did you first contact and with whom did you work closely on the project?

From your experience in observing leaders in this county, have you noticed any crowds that work together?

A. Who are the leaders in these crowds?

B. Are any of these crowds usually in opposition to each other? Have they competed strongly?

Generally speaking, what has been the role or function of the school board in some of the decisions? How much influence does the board have on such decisions? What is the image of the board when seen by county leaders?

What action has the county superintendent taken with respect to influencing decision-making?

Please give a typical example of how the superintendent works with leaders in educational decisions.

Which of the members of the school board has the greatest influence on school affairs? Why is he so influential?

Are there any problems that exist in the county that have been suppressed rather than allow them to become controversial issues? Why were they suppressed?

APPENDIX D

AVERAGE AGE OF LEADERS

District	Age Groups and Number of Leaders									Numbers of Leaders	Mean Age of Leaders
	Over 64	60 to 64	55 to 59	50 to 54	45 to 49	40 to 44	35 to 39	30 to 34	Under 30		
Hub	7	3	2	4	2	6	2	1	0	27	52.1
Farm	10	0	2	4	5	3	2	0	0	26	53.7
Scenic	5	5	4	3	3	4	0	0	1	25	54.1
Anderson	0	2	1	5	9	2	4	1	1	25	46.2
Carter	5	3	4	8	3	6	1	1	0	31	50.5
Benne	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	0	0	23	51.3
Rainier	2	7		17		7		1		34	51.1
Whitney	3	7		9		6		2		27	51.6
Shasta	7	9		1		5		2		34	54.6
Marlboro	5	5	6	9	2	1	0	1	0	29	56.0
Winston	3	3	5	6	4	2	2	0	0	25	55.5
Tareyton	9	4	2	6	3	3	2	1	0	30	55.0
Andrews	4	4	1	4	6	4	1	0	0	24	53.3
Ford	2	3	2	3	3	2	4	2	0	21	48.9
Scott	3	3	4	3	6	3	5	0	0	27	50.6
Logan	3	10		13		8		2		36	51.6
Everest	4	9		10		9		2		34	52.3
McKinley	4	11		10		8		0		33	53.8
Cedar	3	3	4	9	5	4	4	1	0	33	50.6
Pine	9	2	2	8	6	5	5	0	1	38	51.8
Oak	7	8	7	5	6	2	2	1	0	38	55.3
Allwyn	7	4	6	1	4	3	2	0	0	27	56.9
Camelot	6	2	5	5	3	3	1	1	0	26	53.7
Brookston	2	5	9	3	5	4	1	0	0	29	53.9

APPENDIX E

YEARS OF RESIDENCE

District	Years of Residence and Number of Leaders														
	Over 65	61 to 65	56 to 60	51 to 55	46 to 50	41 to 45	36 to 40	31 to 35	26 to 30	21 to 25	16 to 20	11 to 15	6 to 10	1 to 5	Numbers of Leaders
Hub	3	3	1	1		3	1	2	5		2	2	3	1	27
Farm	10		2	2	5	4	3				2				26
Scenic	5	2	3	2	2	3		2	1		1	1		2	25
Anderson			1	3	2	1	1	2	2	3	4	3	2	1	25
Carter	2	1	2	4	3	4	3	3	3	1	3	2			31
Benne		2		4	2	2	4		1	1	3	2		2	23
Rainier		1	1	4	4	4	5	5	4	2	1	1	1	1	34
Whitney	1						4	4	4	3	5	2		3	26
Shasta	4	3	2	3	5	3	3	1	2	3	2	2		1	34
Marlboro	3	3	2	6	1	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1		28
Winston	3	1	4	5	2	1	2	2		2	2		5	1	30
Tareyton	6	1		3	1	4	3	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	30
Andrews	2	2			2	5	2	1		2	5	3			24
Ford	1	1	1		1	3	2	5		1	4	1		1	21
Scott	2		1		5	1	5	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	27
Logan				1	3	3	6	2	3	3	9	5	2		37
Everest						1			3	4	10	3	5	7	33
McKinley		1	1		3	5	8	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	33
Cedar	1	2	1	1	1	4		3	3		4	5	1	4	30
Pine	2	2	1	5	4	6	2	4	1			5	2	4	38
Oak	3	4	6	3	5	2		3	1	2	2	3	1	2	37
Allwyn	2	1	1	3	4	2	2	1	2		4		3	2	27
Camelot	3	2	4	2		3	1	2	2			3	1	3	26
Brookston	1		4	2	4	3	1	3	1	2	4	1	1	2	29

APPENDIX F

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION

District	Years of Formal Education and Number of Leaders																	
	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7 or Less
Hub		1	1	1		1	1	2	8		2	2	4	1	1		2	
Farm					1	1	2	2	5	1	4	2	6	1			1	
Scenic			2		1	1	2	3	3	1	3	4	2		1		2	
Anderson			2			1	3	1	8	2	2	2	3		1			
Carter						1	1	3	8	3	5	3	4		2		1	
Benne					2	2	1	2	10		3	1	2					
Rainier					2	5		1	5	2	8	4	3		1	2		
Whitney			1	2		5	2	2	7		3	1	3				1	
Shasta						1		2	2	3	7	1	11		2	2	1	1
Marlboro	1	1		1	1	5	6	1	7	1	2	1	1					
Winston			2		1	8	2	1	8	1	2	2	2			1		
Tareyton	2				1	5	4	2	7	2	4		2		1			
Andrews		1		1		1	2	3	9		4	1	2					
Ford					1	2	2	1	4	1	2		6			1		1
Scott		1		1	2	2		3	7	3	3	2	3					
Logan					1	5	3		5		3	2	14					
Everest				2		2	2	2	13	7	3	2	1					
McKinley	1					5	3	2	6	3	3	4	2	1			2	
Cedar		1	2			4	1	3	12		2	2	3	1				
Pine			1		1	10	1	7	7	3	1	1	4			1		
Oak			1			13	1	5	9	1	1	1	5					
Allwyn		1		1	1	3	2		11	1	1	1	3				1	
Camelot		1				6	3		7	1	1	1	4		1			
Brookston		1			3	5	1	1	7	1	1	2	2	1	1		2	

APPENDIX G

CHILDREN OF LEADERS

Number of Children of Leaders

District	Number of Leaders in the District (Categorized by number of the children)											
	Above 8	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	No. of Leaders	No. of Children
Hub				1	1	6	6	4	4	5	27	65
Farm						2	10	8	5	1	26	59
Scenic			1		2	4	5	6	3	4	25	63
Anderson				1		2	5	7	8	2	25	51
Carter						3	11	8	7	2	31	68
Benne					2	3	6	5	3	4	23	53
Rainier					4	2	6	13	6	3	34	78
Whitney				1	1	6	4	10	3	2	27	70
Shasta			1		1	3	8	13	4	3	33	78
Marlboro						4	11	11	2	1	29	73
Winston					2	3	10	11	4		30	78
Tareyton		1		1	1	5	8	10		4	30	83
Andrews						2	5	13	4		24	53
Ford					1	4	1	13	1	1	21	51
Scott				3	2	3	4	4	8	3	27	68
Logan	1	1				6	7	13	3	6	37	94
Everest	1				2	2	9	7	11	2	34	79
McKinley		1			2	5	8	12	4		32	90
Cedar					1	2	4	16	4	4	31	61
Pine		1			4	6	11	12	3		36	112
Oak			1		3	4	10	11	4	3	36	94
Allwyn						2	6	10	5	4	27	51
Camelot				1	1	5	7	8	2	2	26	70
Brookston					2	6	6	10	3	2	29	75

School Status of Children of Leaders

District	Pre-School	Elementary	High School	College	Out Of School	Total Number Children	Children in School	Children Out of School
Hub	6	12	16	8	23	65	36	29
Farm	5	10	11	11	22	59	32	27
Scenic	1	10	11	5	36	63	26	37
Anderson	3	10	21	8	9	51	39	12
Carter	3	6	20	13	26	68	39	29
Benne	4	13	13	4	18	53	30	23
Rainier	10	19	9	11	29	78	39	39
Whitney	6	25	9	15	15	70	49	21
Shasta	4	16	14	7	37	78	37	41
Marlboro	5	9	12	18	29	73	34	39
Winston	2	9	11	14	42	78	34	44
Tareyton	7	19	11	16	30	83	46	37
Andrews		10	12	8	23	53	30	23
Ford	7	9	12	4	19	51	25	26
Scott	8	21	19	10	10	68	50	18
Logan	7	21	18	17	31	94	56	38
Everest	6	29	13	9	22	79	51	28
McKinley	7	31	7	14	31	90	52	38
Cedar	4	13	12	21	11	61	46	15
Pine	8	31	24	16	33	112	71	41
Oak	5	13	17	17	42	94	47	47
Allwyn	5	8	12	6	20	51	26	25
Camelot	4	9	8	12	31	64	29	35
Brookston	2	17	20	9	27	75	46	29

APPENDIX H

ORIGINAL RESIDENCE

District	Native Residents of Districts	Total Number of Leaders
Hub	13	27
Farm	20	26
Scenic	20	25
Anderson	8	25
Carter	15	31
Benne	11	23
Rainier	25	36
Whitney	26	32
Shasta	24	36
Marlboro	28	36
Winston	19	33
Tareyton	14	30
Andrews	10	25
Ford	10	22
Scott	11	27
Logan	8	37
Everest	5	39
McKinley	12	36
Cedar	10	31
Pine	17	37
Oak	21	37
Allwyn	6	27
Camelot	12	26
Brookston	14	29

APPENDIX I

MEMBERSHIP OF MORE THAN 50 PER CENT OF LEADERS IN ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations	HUB	FARM	SCENIC	ANDERSON	CARTER	BENNE	RAINIER	WHITNEY	SHASTA	MARLBORO	WINSTON	TARRYTON	ANDREWS	FORD	SCOTT	LOGAN	EVEREST	MCKINLEY	CEDAR	PINE	OAK	ALLWYN	CAMELOT	BROOKSTON
Chamber of Commerce	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Country Club	x			x		x	x	x														x	x	x
Farm Bureau	x	x			x																			
Democratic Party						x	x	x							x									
Kiwanis			x																					
Elks						x					x												x	
Rotary											x			x										
CDA									x									x						
Committee of 100						x	x						x		x									
Yacht Club						x																		
American Legion			x																					
Regal Club																				x				
Industrial Found.																				x				
Scouting														x										
Am. Cancer Society															x									
Red Cross															x									
Concert Association															x									
Social Club																					x			
Masonic	x		x											x										

APPENDIX J

ADULT RELATIVES OF LEADERS IN DISTRICT
EXCLUDING OWN HOUSEHOLD

District	Number of Leaders	Number of Relatives
Hub	27	1,018
Farm	26	533
Scenic	25	3,440
Anderson	25	202
Carter	31	230
Benne	23	238
Rainier	34	779
Whitney	27	155
Shasta	32	974
Marlboro	29	261
Winston	30	316
Tareyton	30	70
Andrews	24	259
Ford	21	80
Scott	27	53
Logan	36	129
Everest	34	36
McKinley	33	171
Cedar	29	176
Pine	37	671
Oak	34	477
Allwyn	27	36
Camelot	26	57
Brookston	29	134

APPENDIX K

PARTICIPATION IN ISSUES

District	Number of Issues and Number of Leaders Participating									Total Number of Issues	Total Number Involved
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0		
Hub					8	11	5	4	3	4	79
Farm					8	6	3	6	7	4	62
Scenic					4	5	9	7	3	4	56
Anderson					3	4	9	6		4	48
Carter				1		4	7	11		5	42
Benne						1	6	9		3	24
Rainier				2	14	9	6	4		6	109
Whitney			2	8	5	8	3	5		6	107
Shasta					1	14	14	6		4	80
Marlboro				4	8	8	9	7		5	101
Winston				5	2	11	6	6	3	5	84
Tareyton				4	4	9	11	2		5	87
Andrews					11	6	7	1		4	77
Ford					11	3	5	3		4	66
Scott					6	12	7	2		4	76
Logan				2	1	11	12	6		6	77
Everest	4	4	6	2	4	9	5	4		10	163
McKinley				3	9	8	7	4		8	93
Cedar					10	3	8	10	4	4	75
Pine			2	5	6	11	6	7	2	6	113
Oak			3	14	11	2	5	2	2	6	150
Allwyn				2	7	5	9	4		5	75
Camelot				4	6	9	6	2	1	5	85
Brookston				7	11	7	3	3		5	109

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Perry R. "Socioeconomic Factors Associated with Patterns of School Fiscal Policy in Kentucky." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, June, 1965.

2. Agger, Robert., Daniel Goldrich, and B. E. Swanson. The Rulers and the Ruled. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

3. Bailey, Stephen K., Richard T. Frost, Paul E. Marsh, and Robert C. Wood. Schoolmen and Politics. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962.

4. Banfield, E. C., and J. Q. Wilson. City Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

5. Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

6. Easley, John W. "Comparative Characteristics of the Power Structures of Three Selected Georgia School Districts." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1965.

7. Fabricant, Solomon. Prerequisites for Economic Growth. Conference Board Studies in Business Economics, No. 66. New York: National Industrial Conference Board, 1959.

8. Ficker, Victor B. "Factors Contributing to Change in Fiscal Support in Seven Selected School Districts." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1967.

9. Form, W. H., and W. V. D'Antonio. "Integration and Cleavage Among Community Influentials in Two Border Cities," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), 804-814.

10. Greer, Scott. Governing the Metropolis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

11. Gregg, Russell T. "Political Dimensions of Educational Administration," Teachers College Record, 67 (November, 1965), 119-128.

12. Groves, Harold M. "Education and Economic Growth." Dimensions in School Finance. Edited by J. K. Norton. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association Committee on Educational Finance, 1966.

13. Hopper, Harold H. "Socioeconomic Factors Associated with Patterns of School Fiscal Policy in Florida." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, June, 1965.

14. Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill, N. C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

15. Hyman, H. H., and L. R. Wright. "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults," American Journal of Sociology, XXII (June, 1958), 357-368.

16. Johns, Thomas L. "Analyses of Power Systems of Three Selected Low Effort School Districts in Kentucky." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, April, 1967.

17. Kammerer, G. M., C. D. Farris, J. M. DeGrove, and A. B. Clubok. City Managers in Politics. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1962.

18. Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964.

19. Kimbrough, R. B., and R. L. Johns. "Relationship Between Socio-Economic Factors, Educational Leadership Patterns, and Elements of Community Power Structure and Local School Fiscal Policy." Appendix A. U. S. Office of Education Project Proposal #2842, University of Florida, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

20. King, Charles R. "Socioeconomic Factors Associated with Patterns of School Fiscal Policy in Georgia." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, June, 1965.

21. Marlantes, Leo. "Comparative Characteristics of Power Structures of Three Selected Low-Effort School Districts in Illinois." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1966.

22. Marsh, William R. "Characteristics of the Power Structure of Six Florida School Districts Selected on the Basis of Population, Educational Effort, and Elasticity of Demand for Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, December, 1965.

23. Miller, D. C. "Industry and Community Power Structure: A Comparative Study of an American and English City," American Sociological Review, 23 (February, 1958), 9-15.

24. Mills, C. W. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 195 .

25. Minar, David W. Ideas and Politics: the American Experience. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1964.

26. Morphet, E. L., R. L. Johns, and T. L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

27. Norton, John K. (ed.) Dimensions in School Finance. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association Committee on Educational Finance, 1966.

28. Owens, David A. "Comparative Characteristics of the Power Structure of Three Selected High-Effort School Districts in Illinois." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1966.

29. Palmer, Richard D. "Comparative Characteristics of the Power Structures of Three Selected Low-Effort Georgia School Districts." Unpublished study for U. S. Office of Education Project #2842, University of Florida, April, 1966.

30. Polsby, N. W. "The Problems in the Analysis of Community Power," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), 796-803.

31. Presthus, Robert. Men at the Top. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

32. Quick, Walter J. "Socioeconomic Factors Associated with Patterns of School Fiscal Policy in Illinois." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1965.

33. Sayre, W., and H. Kaufman. Governing New York City. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960.

34. Scaggs, James L. "The Interactions of Superintendents with Community Power Systems in Twenty-Four Selected School Districts." Unpublished study for U. S. Office of Education Project #2842, University of Florida, June, 1967.

35. Schultz, Theodore W. "Education and Economic Growth." Social Forces Influencing American Education. Sixtieth Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

36. Shaffer, Robert L. "Comparative Characteristics of the Power Structure of Three Selected High-Effort School Districts in Kentucky." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, August, 1966.

37. Stanley, William O. Education and Social Integration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1953.

38. Thometz, Carol Estes. The Decision-Makers: The Power Structure of Dallas. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

William Howard Bashaw was born July 7, 1927, at Gainesville, Florida. In June, 1945, he was graduated from Gainesville High School. From July, 1945, until August, 1946, he served in the United States Navy. In June, 1959, he received the degree of Bachelor of Science with a major in Physical Education from the University of Florida. He spent two years teaching in Florida and one year teaching in the Naval Base School at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, before returning to the University of Florida in 1953, where he served as a graduate assistant in the College of Education and received the degree of Master of Science. He taught from 1954 to 1962 at the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School at the University of Florida. During this time he worked toward the degree of Specialist in Education, which he received in 1962. From 1962 to 1966 he served as Assistant Finance Officer for the Manatee County, Florida, Board of Public Instruction. From September, 1966, until the present time he has pursued his work toward the degree of Doctor of Education.

William Howard Bashaw is married to the former Myrtle Walton and is the father of two children. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Florida Education Association, National Education Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the Florida School Finance Officers Association.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

March, 1968.

B Shaw G M E Barker
Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School

Supervisory Committee:

R. L. Johns
Dr. R. L. Johns, Chairman

R. B. Kimbrough
Dr. R. B. Kimbrough

C. M. Bridges, Jr.
Dr. C. M. Bridges, Jr.

C. L. Robbins
Mr. C. L. Robbins